

A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS

7:1 - 8:4

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

THE FORM, STRUCTURE, AND MEANING

OF 7:7-25.

Donald J.B. McAlister, M.A., B.D.

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

1974.



# ABSTRACT OF THESIS.

Romans 7 is a famous crux interpretum. Its interpretation forms a Chapter of its own in the history of Pauline Studies. The purpose of this Thesis is to survey the field, identify the issues involved, indicate conclusions reached on these, and then suggest an approach to the problem which, we claim, meets many of the requirements of the case.

Chapter 1 summarises the results of our investigations into the questions which belong to the sphere of "Introduction". We describe the Epistle as essentially a "creative synthesis". In assessing the Epistle a balance must be established between the background which is personal to Paul, the historical Church situation and the destination of the Letter. The purpose and structure of the Epistle are considered.

Chapter 2 affirms the basic antithetical nature of Paul's thought and traces the development of the concept of law which belongs to this fundamental antithesis, until it becomes the major interest in Chapter 7.

Chapter 3 explores the immediate context of the passage within which 7:7-25 is a digression.

Chapter 4 extends the viewpoint to the Epistle as a whole. Our passage is related in particular to three other sections in the Epistle, namely, 1:18-3:20; 5:12-21; 9:1-11:36. The connecting link is the salvation history mode of thought.

Chapter 5 concentrates attention on the understanding of the ἐν in 7:7ff. A sketch is offered of the main interpretations which have been advanced, in order to give some appreciation of the history of the problem.



Then note is taken of certain important attempts in recent times to clarify the problems in which positive contributions are made, in particular by W.G. Kummel and R. Bultmann. An examination is made of other passages in Paul's writings from which light may be thrown on 7:7ff and the search for antecedents and parallels to the "I"-form is extended to the wider literary field. Attention is given to a possible relationship with Qumran. The conclusion is that the Old Testament and Judaism provide the relevant sources. Two major issues for the understanding of the ἐγώ are investigated - its relation to the Christian and then to Paul himself. A controlling eschatological tension is identified in each case, in the light of which negative answers are reached. Two lesser issues are dealt with - the primary theme of the passage is recognised as the function of the law in God's plan and the standpoint of the passage is defined as Christian.

Chapter 6 proposes that 7:7-25 should be identified as an explicit dramatisation and arguments are advanced in support. The controverted issue of a Genesis allusion in vv7ff is dealt with exegetically with a positive conclusion. Factors in the preceding verses which predispose toward a dramatic portrayal are indicated. Hints are collected from the extensive literature and these supply tentative pointers in the direction we have travelled. Appeal is made to three essays of special interest, by P. Benoit, B. Ramm and H. Jonas. It is readily granted that a dramatic presentation is hardly what one would expect from the Hebrew background of Paul, but again predisposing factors can be adduced in Paul's frequent use of metaphor and apocalyptic imagery, in his use of the theological

concept of "corporate personality", and in his personal adaptability. Arguments are led against too narrow an interpretation of ἄνθρωπος in the passage. A multiple use is in happy accord with our insistence on a dramatic portrayal.

Chapter 7 seeks to analyse the passage in accordance with the view of its literary form which has been proposed. In this analysis exegesis is of first importance. Four scenes in the drama are identified, comprising vv7-11; 12-13; 14-24; 25a, to which there is appended a summarising conclusion or epilogue, v25b. The purpose of each scene and of the summarising conclusion is described and the content is dissected. In Scene 3, vv14-24, the proposal is made that a soliloquy is before us within the over-all dramatic portrayal. We claim that this insight helps to clarify some of the hitherto intractable problems. The essential continuity between vv14ff and vv7ff is affirmed. The famous conflict or split is carefully analysed and is shown to consist of a conflict within a conflict, the one objective and the other subjective. Consideration is given to disputed issues - whether Paul is a systematic theologian, how his anthropological terms are to be understood, the extent to which he was influenced by Hebrew and by Greek culture.

Chapter 8 presents the conclusions of our study. The search for a "key" to unlock all the problems is dismissed. The importance of an appreciation of the dramatic form and of attention to the eschatological factor is emphasised. The argument is summed up and five important questions are answered in the light of our investigation. The thesis ends with a summary of the main advantages resulting from the recognition of the dramatic form of 7:7-25.

PREFACE.

I acknowledge with gratitude the expert guidance and kindly help of the Rev. Prof. Hugh Anderson and the Rev. Dr. I.A. Moir, both of the University of Edinburgh, also in the early stages the Rev. Prof. R.A.S. Barbour now of the University of Aberdeen.

Thanks are also due to the staff of the Library of New College, Edinburgh for their assistance in obtaining many of the necessary books, and to Mrs. A.N. Renton who typed the final MSS.

I dedicate this study to my beloved wife, Marda, without whose support and encouragement this Thesis could not have been started, continued or completed.

Donald J.B. McAlister.

April 1974.

# ABBREVIATIONS.

We take for granted the common abbreviations, beyond which we list the following. Full information as to name of author, title of volume or article, and source is given on the first occasion of use in each of the two parts into which the Thesis is divided. Thereafter, as seemed to be required, we have used the forms op. cit. and ibid., or fuller information, the latter particularly in the case of authors who are represented by a number of works or after due lapse of fuller citation. Complete bibliographical information will be found in the Bibliography.

B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
E.G.T.	Expositor's Greek Testament.
H.T.R.	Harvard Theological Review.
J.B.L.	Journal of Biblical Literature.
J.T.S.	Journal of Theological Studies.
LXX.	The Old Testament in the Septuagint Version.
N.T.S.	New Testament Studies.
R.B.	Revue Biblique.
S.J.T.	Scottish Journal of Theology.
T.D.N.T.	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.
T.W.N.T.	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
Z.N.T.W.	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
Z.Th.K.	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Title Page.	i
Abstract.	ii-iv
Preface.	v
Abbreviations.	vi
Table of Contents.	vii-xiii

Part One. 1-63.Chapter 1. Matters of Introduction. 1-26.

Some Presuppositions.	1-3
authorship	1
integrity	1-2
date and place of composition	2-3
The Milieu of Romans.	4-19
The inner world of Paul	4-9
a creative synthesis	7
The outer world	9-19
the significance of Rome	9-10
the Church at Rome	11-15
the composition of the Church	15-19
The Purpose of Romans.	19-21
a broad-based approach	20
the personal factor	20-21
the destination	21
The Structure of Romans.	22-26
the whole : 1-16	22
the part : 1-8	23-26

Chapter 2. The Concept of Law Prior to  
Chapter 7.

27-39.

Paul's thought antithetical	27-28
within the developing argument	28-39
1:1-17 the good news	29-30
the old and the new connected	29-30
1:18 - 3:20 the bad news	30-34
the complex of ideas	30
law as revelation	31-32
law as description	33
law as prescription	33

3:21-31	a positive statement	34
	<u>ἕντες ὅμοιοι</u>	34
	unity and continuity	34
3:31		35-36
4:1-25	Abraham - the new in the old	36-37
5:1-21	a positive statement	37
	vvl-11 present possession of	
	the eschatological blessing	37
	vvl2-21 the two representative	
	men	37-38
6:1-23	the new situation for faith	38
	vvl-14 its relation to sin	38-39
	vvl5-23 union with Christ	39

Chapter 3. The Immediate Context of 7:7-25. 40-51.

The relationships of 7:1-6	40-47
7:1-6 and Chapter 6	40-44
the backward connections	41-44
7:1	41
7:4	41-43
7:5	44
7:6	44
7:1-6 and 7:7-25	45-46
the forward connections	45-46
7:1-6 and 8:1ff	46-47
7:7-25 a digression	46
The relationship of 7:7-25 and Chapter 8	48-51
polar opposites	48
the contrast	48-51

Chapter 4. The Epistolary Context of 7:7-25. 56-62.

The fourfold framework	52
1:18 - 3:20	52-53
5:12-21	53-54
9-11	54-60
7:7ff and 9-11	60
the salvation history mode as	
connecting link	61-62

Part Two. 64-255.Chapter 5. The εὐω in 7:7-25.

63-132.

1. History of Interpretation.	63-69
difficulty of classification	63
Augustine and Luther	63-65
the broad outline	65-67
the autobiographical view	65-67
the rhetorical-general view	67-68
the salvation-history view	68-69
the <u>εὐω</u> : Christian; non-Christian	69
2. Recent Significant Contributions.	70-78
W.G. Kummel	70-71
R. Bultmann	71-73
S. Lyonnet	73
P. Benoit	74
E. Ellwein	74
C.L. Mitton	75
K.G. Kuhn and H. Braun	75-78
3. Other Uses of the <u>εὐω</u> in Paul.	78-80
Kummel's lists	78
a cohortative use	78
a stylistic use	79
4. The "I"-form in Jewish and Other Literature.	80-92
Greek and Latin Literature	80-81
The O.T. Psalms	81
Isa. 50	82
the rabbinic debate	82-83
4 Ezra and Baruch	83
the Qumran texts	84-92
1. theological dualism	84
the consensus	85
P. Wernberg-Møller	86
Persian influence	87-90
2. parallels to the "I"-form	90
3. the Jewish background	92

5. The εὐω in the Interpretation of 7:7-25.

93-132

a. The primary theme of the passage.	93-96
the purpose of the law	93
a defence of the law	94
one controlling interest	95
b. The <u>εὐω</u> and the Christian.	96-113
difficulties	96-98
the Christian use of the passage	98
the eschatological tension	98-102
conflict in the Christian	102-104
Paul's knowledge of Jesus	103-104
the essential paradox	105-107
J.A. Bengel	107
a warning	108
a guiding principle	109
C.L. Mitton	110
E. Ellwein	110-111
the practical use of 7:7ff	112
c. The <u>εὐω</u> and Paul.	114-128
no direct relation	114
an indirect relation	114
the dramatic form	116
the salvation history scheme	116
J. Munck	116-118
the eschatological fulcrum	120
Paul's conversion	121
the sources	121
the event	122-124
J.G. McKenzie	124
W.G. Kummel	125-128
d. The standpoint of the passage.	129-132
Jesus Christ the starting-point	129
continuity of old and new	130
the dramatic form	131-132



## Chapter 6. The Literary Form of 7:7-25.

133-173

conclusion	133
the Genesis allusion	133-149
v7 <u>ἐπιθυμία</u> and <u>ἐκ ἐπιθυμίας</u>	134-137
Kummel	137-138
other views	138
Lyonnet	139-140
the teaching of Jesus	140-141
v8 <u>νόμος</u> and <u>ἐντολή</u>	141
<u>νόμοι</u>	142
v9 <u>ἐξω</u>	142-143
v10 <u>δυνάτος</u>	144
v11 <u>ἐξήπατο</u>	144
v12 <u>νόμος</u> and <u>ἐντολή</u>	145
v13 a clarification of v10	145
a Genesis allusion defended	146-149
the dramatic form of 7:7-25	149-168
predisposing factors	149
the vocabulary	150
E. Fuchs	151
significant hints in the literature	151-154
P. Benoit	154-155
B. Ramm	155-157
H. Jonas	157-160
drama in Judaism	160-164
predisposing factors	164
metaphor and apocalyptic	164
corporate personality	165-167
adaptability	167
the multiple use of <u>νόμος</u> in 7:7-25	168-172
as Mosaic	168
as Genesis precept	169
as principle or rule	169
as divine imperative or	
conversely religious awareness	170
<u>νόμος</u> and the <u>ἐγώ</u>	172
summary	173

Chapter 7. The Literary Structure of 7:7-25.

174-248

the five constituent parts	174-175
the priority of exegesis	175

Scene One. vv1-11. 176-188

the connection between law and sin	176
v7 <u>ἐγνων</u>	177
v8 <u>ἁμαρτία</u>	178
v9 no reference to childhood	180-182
<u>ἐζων</u>	182
v10 <u>ἀπέθανεν</u>	184
v11 <u>ἐξοπατήρεν</u>	184-186
v12 <u>ἀπέκτεινεν</u>	187

Scene Two. vv12f. 188-194

v12 the opening verse	188
v13 <u>θάνατος</u>	189-190
the <u>ἐν</u> clauses	191-193
<u>καὶ ὑπερβολὴν</u>	192-194

Scene Three. vv14-24. 194-233

a soliloquy	194
continuity of vv14ff and vv7ff	195-196
the unity of 7:7-25	196
Kummel's displacement hypothesis	197
the length of Scene Three	198
the conflict in vv14ff	199
the two conflicts	200-203
inadequate views thereon	204-205
K. Stendahl	206-207
E. Kasemann	208
guidelines for the anthropology of vv14ff	208-209
Paul a systematic theologian?	209-212
the scene in detail	212
v14 <u>πεπρωμένος</u>	212
the change in tense	214-215
v15 an elaboration	216
vv16ff two inferences	216
vv18-20 repetition	217
v21 summary of vv14ff	217

vv22f	the anthropological problems	217
	<i>ὁ ἐξω ἀνθρώπων</i>	217-222
	stimulus diffusion	222-223
	the theological problem	224-227
	<i>ὁὐς</i>	227
v24	the cry of despair	228
	the influence of Hebrew and Greek cultures on Paul	229-233
<u>Scene Four.</u>	<u>v25a.</u>	234-239
	the textual problem	234
	the thanksgiving	235-238
	the brevity of Scene Four	238-239
<u>The Summarising Conclusion.</u>	<u>v25b.</u>	239-248
	the textual problem	239-242
	a summarising antithesis	243
	<i>ἀπὸ οὐ</i>	243-244
	<i>ἀντὶς ἐξω</i>	244-247
	<i>συνέβη</i>	247
<u>Chapter 8.</u>	<u>Conclusion.</u>	249-255
	no "key" available	249
	resume of argument	249-251
	five important questions	251-252
	summary of main advantages of understanding a dramatic presentation.	253-255
<u>Bibliography.</u>		256-285.

"..... come to this New Testament theatre."

Alexander Whyte.

MATTERS OF INTRODUCTION.CHAPTER 1.SOME PRESUPPOSITIONS.

We first state certain assumptions which underlie our approach to our subject. Regarding the authorship of the Epistle to the Romans the consensus is so heavily on the side of the Apostle Paul, this may be assumed without more ado.<sup>1.</sup> We likewise assume the integrity of the Epistle as traditionally received.<sup>2.</sup> T.W. Manson's restatement of the

---

1. The effort of the Dutch School (on whom see A. Schweitzer, "Paul and His Interpreters", 1912, pp. 118ff; J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, pp. 236, 461; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, "The Epistle to the Romans", 5th. Edition, 1902, pp. lxxxviff) which came after F.C. Baur and outdid his radical zeal, has no more than an historical interest and is rightly relegated by T.W. Manson (Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962, p. 940, para. 815a - hereafter designated "Peake 1962") to the "eccentricities of criticism". cf. also W.G. Kümmel, "Introduction to the New Testament", 1966, p. 178. The attempt by R.M. Hawkins, "Romans: A Reinterpretation", J.B.L., 60 (1941), 129-140, to isolate "genuine" Pauline material, starting from a supposed dislocation at 2:13ff in the interest of a Hellenistic interpretation of Christianity addressed to an excessively Jewish Church, is not convincing. There is no MSS. evidence to support the contention; the treatment is too brief by far; the canons are too subjective.

2. The textual tradition is very complicated. The arguments against the Roman destination of Chapter 16 may be balanced by arguments in favour. cf. C.H. Dodd, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans", 1932, pp. xixff; J.B. Lightfoot, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians", 1873, pp. 171ff; D. Guthrie, "New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles", 1963, 2nd. Edition, pp. 29ff; P.S. Minear, "The Obedience of Faith", 1971, pp. 22ff. See especially W.G. Kümmel's view, op. cit., pp. 222ff and his conclusion p. 226: "The supposition that the original text of 'Romans' contained 1:1 - 16:23, therefore, explains the textual tradition the most convincingly..." cf. also T. Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", 1909, 1, p. 393; A.F.J. Klijn, "An Introduction to the New Testament", 1967, p. 81; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), "Paul", 1953, p. 82.

old theory of an Ephesian destination for Chapter 16<sup>1</sup> is certainly attractive but he can advance no conclusive MSS. support and his arguments in favour can be matched by arguments against.

The limits in time within which Romans can fall are narrow. The date lies within the period 54-59 A.D. The balance of probability seems to us to rest on the winter<sup>2</sup> of 57-58 A.D.<sup>3</sup>, although a year earlier can also be supported.<sup>4</sup> The place of writing is almost certainly

1. "Studies in the Gospels and Epistles", (ed. M. Black), 1962, pp. 225-241 (reprinted from B.J.R.L., 31 (1948), 224-240: "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others"). cf. "Peake 1962", p. 940, para. 815c to e, where Manson claims support from P46, the Chester Beatty papyrus codex from near the end of the 2nd. century A.D. which represents the neutral or Alexandrian text. The sequence of Romans in P46 is: 1-15; 16:25-27; 16:1-23. In support and against H. Lietzmann's earlier objection, cf. E.J. Goodspeed, "Phoebe's Letter of Introduction", H.T.R., 44 (1951), 55-57.

2. The Mediterranean was closed for navigation till March 10th (F.F. Bruce, "The New Bible Commentary", 1954, 2nd Edition, p. 925; cf. W.M. Ramsay, "The Expositor", 6th Series, 4, (1901), 407). The voyage would probably be planned for one of the Jewish pilgrim ships plying between Corinth and Palestine in connection with the Easter festival in Jerusalem (J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p. 310).

3. A date within the years 57-58 A.D. is adopted by, among others, E.H. Gifford, "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans", 1886, p.2; T. Zahn, op. cit., pp. 434f; B.M. Metzger, "The New Testament: its background, growth and content", 1965, pp. 208ff; A. Wikenhauser, "New Testament Introduction", 1956, p.405; J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, p. 394. Among those who hold a slightly earlier date within 55-56 A.D. are: T.M. Taylor, "The Place of Origin of Romans", J.B.L., 67 (1948) 295; T.W. Manson, op. cit., p.259; C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.5; W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.220. A.F.J. Klijn, op. cit., p.78 suggests 56-57 A.D.

4. No absolute chronology is possible for the life of Paul. At best a relative scheme can be devised. The most secure starting point is the date assigned to Paul's appearance before Gallio (Ac. 18:12ff), from which we can argue forward through the itinerary of the "Third Journey". Calculation can also be made backward from the replacement of Felix as Procurator of Judaea by Festus. These dates however cannot be fixed

Corinth<sup>1.</sup> at the close of the so-called Third Missionary Journey.<sup>2.</sup>

(cont'd) with certainty, especially the latter. The probable dates of Gallio's term of office as proconsul in Achaia are 51-52 A.D. (cf. G. Ogg, "The Chronology of the Life of Paul", 1968, pp.104-111; D. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 181, 274f; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., pp. 4f; K.F. Nickle, "The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy", 1966, p.38. For a discussion of the problem with text and translation see "The Beginnings of Christianity": Vol. 5, Part 1, The Acts of the Apostles, ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, 1933, pp.460ff. Either 56-57 A.D. or 57-58 A.D. fits the progress of events, probably the latter. J. Knox, "Chapters in a Life of Paul", 1954, offers an earlier chronological scheme for Paul which reflects his extreme scepticism regarding the historical reliability of Acts, in which Paul reaches Jerusalem with the collection in 53 A.D. This view, we think rightly, has not gained significant support. G. Ogg claims that Paul arrived in Jerusalem in 59 A.D.

1. Ac. 19:21; 20:2-3 tell us that Paul has come from Macedonia to Greece. As 2 Cor. says that Paul was on his way to Corinth when he was in Macedonia, we may assume that his destination in Greece was Corinth, his intention being to spend three winter months there, before going to Jerusalem. (cf. J. Munck, "Christ and Israel", 1967, p.8 n3.) T.M. Taylor, op. cit., argues at length against Corinth and in favour of Philippi during Passion Week in 55 A.D. We think the date too early; the time available too short for composition; and the picture suggested of the Church environment at Corinth too pessimistic. cf. R.M. Grant, "A Historical Introduction to the New Testament", 1963, p.188, for a similar view. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.3, considers a Corinthian location to be "overwhelmingly probable".

2. The classification of Paul's labours into three missionary journeys is not altogether satisfactory. cf. W. Wrede, "Paul", 1907, pp.43ff; A. Sabatier, "The Apostle Paul", 1891, p.279; W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.875, para. 764f; G.B. Caird, "The Apostolic Age", 1955, p.124. There was missionary work before the first "journey" and the progress during Paul's life was not according to a tidy timetable. The division however is convenient and traditional and may be followed with advantage although with qualification.

### THE MILIEU OF ROMANS.

Classic works are not produced in a vacuum nor are they wholly determined by factors conscious to their creator. In order to understand the complex environment of the Epistle we must look at the life situation of Paul in the first place, then at the general situation in the expanding Church and finally at the Roman Church itself.

When we explore the inner world of Paul to which Romans belongs we find that he has arrived at a significant point in his life, a "provisional terminus" in the apt phrase of J. Denney.<sup>1</sup> The excitements of the past lie behind him after a Church-founding evangelism in the east, and especially the north-east area, of the Mediterranean basin. The Gospel has been fully preached (πεπληρωκέμεν 15:19) in an embracing arc from Jerusalem to Illyricum.<sup>2</sup> This cannot mean that everyone in the area<sup>3</sup> has heard the Gospel from Paul far less that they have believed. The reference should be understood in a representative sense, some have heard and believed and they stand for

1. "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans", The Expositor, Series 6, 3 (1901), 1.

2. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.276: "Acts gives no account of work in Illyricum, though from Macedonia the Via Egnatia struck across the Balkans to the eastern coast of the Adriatic, and it is not impossible that Paul or his associates had made tentative excursions in this direction as far as Illyricum". cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.52 nl.

3. An area of some 300,000 square miles - J. Knox, op. cit., p.107.



their nation or area.<sup>1.</sup> The strain of the preceding years, so full of unremitting toil, notable achievement, great personal hardships and recurring antagonisms, are clear to us in the Corinthian and Galatian Epistles. Now there is a period of quiet at Corinth.<sup>2.</sup> The winter months impose their restraint on travel. Paul has opportunity to recuperate his energies among his own "children". The past has time to catch up with the future. In a word the psychological conditions are right for a reflective, creative, interpretative, synthesising episode.

1. The use of πεπληρωκεν rather than a form of κηρυκεν in 15:19 indicates more than a simple statement of the fact that Paul has preached. Nor does it mean that he has proclaimed the full Gospel, which we can take for granted. We touch here the important Semitic concept of solidarity which will occupy us later. N.E.B. reads: "I have completed the preaching". W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich (editors), "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature", 1957, p.677: "bring (the preaching of) the Gospel to completion" - hereafter designated "Arndt-Gingrich". J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, "The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament", 1930, p.520: "The common NT use of πληρωω = 'accomplish' a duty..." cf. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., pp.408ff; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.276; F.F. Bruce, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans", 1963, p.261; J. Murray, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1967, Part 2, p.214; J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.48, 51ff, 301, see also his "Christ and Israel", 1967, p.98. Munck relates 15:19 to his particular view of the "fulness of the Gentiles".

2. J. Denney, op. cit., p.3: "But through all conflicts of thought and passion he had come into a great peace; and that peace, which rests on the Epistle to the Romans like sunlight on the sea..." cf. A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.185; T. Zahn, op. cit., p.434; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., pp.10, 14. Perhaps some preparatory work was done during the long stay in Ephesus?

Paul has followed a pioneering policy (15:20), preaching the Gospel where Christ has not been named.<sup>1</sup> His restless mind with its obsessive missionary zeal<sup>2</sup> looks to the future. He has a sense of limited fulfilment within the terms of his strategic concept. There is no longer any totus (15:23), "sphere of activity",<sup>3</sup> in the East. A new Act in the drama in which Paul played the part of Apostle-in-Chief to the Gentiles is about to begin, but first there will be an interval. The undertaking so willingly given to remember the poor (Gal. 2:10) has come to a happy conclusion. The collection must be taken to Jerusalem (15:25). We think it better to regard Paul's conveyance of this money from personal motives rather than from a high eschatological doctrine.<sup>4</sup> His continuing mission was more important than one significant episode within it. He intends to fulfil his promise in person and pay a visit

1. It is not clear whether this should be understood as a device to save time, an economic use of resources, a strict interpretation of his commission, or merely as a quirk of temperament. We must allow for the self-correcting mechanism which rescues the enthusiast from too rigid an adherence to his fixed principles.

2. This is to be derived in part from Paul's temperament - he was "that type" - but mainly from the impetus given by the encounter near Damascus and from the dynamic of the Spirit in him.

3. W. Marxsen, "Introduction to the New Testament", 1968, p.93. N.E.B. reads "no further scope".

4. K.F. Nickle, "The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy", 1966, offers a study in depth of Paul's collection project. He finds its prototype in the relief fund from Antioch on the occasion of the grave economic situation at Jerusalem, probably in 48 A.D. He also recognises analogies in certain Jewish monetary institutions - the half shekel Temple tax in particular, the Jewish contributions for charity and the later Patriarchal tax. The unresolved tension in the Church at Antioch following Peter's "hypocrisy" poses acutely the question of the role of the Gentiles in the "Heilsgeschichte" and leads Paul to invest the collection with heightened theological significance. Nickle distinguishes three levels in

once more to the mother city before he travels west. He allows himself the opportunity of renewing fellowship. It is clear from 15:30ff however that Paul has serious misgivings about the intended visit. An anxious note intrudes. This threat of danger sharpens the point of his reflections as he sees the future in terms of a mission in the West and recalls the past in terms of a mission in the East.

Paul produced his great Epistle from within this personal situation. It is essentially a creative synthesis. It is a synthesis in that he gathers together elements from the past. It is creative in that Paul organises his past experience in the service of his future hopes. We think that light can be thrown on this process in Paul by the

---

(cont'd) the project:1. It is an act of Christian charity;2. It expresses the solidarity of the Christian fellowship, Jew and Gentile;3. It is an eschatological exercise - the "eschatological pilgrimage" (p.142) of the Gentile Christian delegates to Jerusalem will fulfil Old Testament expectation and move the Jews to jealousy and thus to the Gospel. 1. and 2. were successful, especially 2., but 3. was a "crashing failure". The collection is presented as the first venture consciously inaugurated to restore the threatened unity of the Church. (p.9). Among commentators there is wide recognition of the importance of solidarity and of the special position of the Jerusalem Church but there is no unanimity as to the precise eschatological significance. J. Munck, whom Nickle largely follows, develops this understanding to the highest point. Nickle notes that the collection spanned the known period of Paul's missionary activity from Antioch to Rome and assumes that the effort expended was in proportion to the theological significance. He concludes that the journey to Jerusalem was "the culmination and embodiment of Paul's entire apostleship" (p.143).

study of creative mental processes in general.<sup>1.</sup> In Paul's case the synthesis was compounded of his cataclysmic experience on the way to Damascus, his background in the Old Testament and Judaism, his contact with the primitive Church, his missionary experiences, his own personality, the cultural ethos, and his continuing relationship with the Lord and the Spirit. The point in time served as catalyst. We do not pretend that

---

1. See especially L.E. Cole, "General Psychology", 1939, pp.553-559, on "Creative Imagination and the Unconscious". He first quotes J.H. Poincare's analysis of his own mathematical thought processes. There is: 1. voluntary conscious effort in assembling material and initiating subconscious perseveration processes; 2. unconscious incubation and elaboration; 3. the flash of illumination; 4. verification and final shaping and testing. He then refers to Lowe's study of S.T. Coleridge and the writing of "The Ancient Mariner". The poet's diaries and notebooks detail his reading in the period preceding the composition. Lowe claims that given the materials from the research period, the chance mention of an albatross in conversation and the conscious effort of composition, the creative process in this instance can be laid bare. Elements from the material studied "had been milling about in the unconscious during the long period of incubation, forming new constellations, acclimatising themselves within this Coleridge environment, until that time when the crystallising idea of the albatross precipitated the whole structure". Cole does not pretend that the creative process is wholly understood and he does not oversimplify. The unconscious is one factor in a many-sided complex but an important one. See also the investigation by C. Maurat, "The Brontë's Secret", 1969, p.49, of the literary genius of the Brontë sisters. She discovers the background of their work, which appeared so suddenly and without apparent antecedent, in the rich fantasy world of their past, on which they drew when "the moment of maturity" came. Also cf. J.E. Morpurgo, "Barnes Wallis", 1972, p.348: "It always interests me (i.e. B. Wallis) how wonderfully the terms of a desperately difficult problem become clarified after working on it for several years; and how, in the light of the clarified terms the true solution gradually is revealed, till so clear does it become that we can reduce what was once an amorphous conglomeration of unreconcilable requirements to the severe and economical form of a syllogism". The comments of L. Bernstein on Beethoven's notebooks in relation to his Fifth Symphony (D. Ewen, "Leonard Bernstein", 1967, pp.112f) are also relevant, as is the material in "Executive Health", 4, 2, (1967). This approach relates to T.W. Manson's view of Romans as summary and manifesto; cf. G. Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament", Australian Biblical Review, XI (1963, Dec.) 2ff, and his "Paul", 1971, pp.88ff.

Romans can be taken apart like a jig-saw puzzle, still less that we can fully comprehend Paul, but some understanding of the creative process is important and helps us to anchor Paul firmly within common humanity. Romans is a creative synthesis. It is not just an Epistle, it is Paul's Epistle.

We turn now to the outer world to which Romans belongs. Some twenty-five years intervened between the Pentecost event and the writing of Romans. A remarkable expansion of the Church had taken place. Jerusalem and Antioch seeded the Gospel far and wide. B.M. Metzger<sup>1</sup> with a rather wider period in view writes, "Within thirty to forty years after the death of Jesus, every major city of Asia Minor, Greece and Italy had one or more Christian congregations". Paul was by no means the first or the only one to work in the field of the Gentile mission.<sup>2</sup> Apostles and apostolic men, preachers and witnesses were at work. When he plans with Spain in view he inevitably does so in terms of the already established Church and in particular the Church at Rome. We should allow Paul an interest in Rome for its own sake. It was the secular Jerusalem and he was a Roman citizen. There is no need to destroy Paul's humanity by writing out all motives of human interest and ambition. These were the servants of his destiny but they were there. Beyond this natural ambition

1. op. cit., p.171. cf. W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.872, para. 762a: "Paul's activity took place within the context of a vast missionary expansion"; G.B. Caird, op. cit., p.89.

2. Among many writers cf. A.M. Hunter, "Paul and His Predecessors", 1961 new revised edition, passim; J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.208f; E.E. Ellis, "Paul and his Co-Workers", N.T.S. 17 (1970-71), 437-452.



lay his immediate strategic interest, the mission to Spain.<sup>1.</sup> It is easy to see Rome as a base from which the intended operation might proceed without recourse to a controlling eschatological motive. Paul was well aware of the advantage of such a base from his experience in Tarsus and Antioch and Jerusalem and Ephesus.<sup>2.</sup>

1. G. La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire", *H.T.R.* 20 (1927), 396ff, emphasises the strategic importance of Rome for Paul and the vindication of this awareness in later years in that Christianity developed more strongly in the West than in the East, which he attributes to the role played by Rome. J. Munck maintains that Paul, frustrated by lack of response from the Jews at Jerusalem at "the offering of the Gentiles", saw Rome and the Emperor as the final opportunity of witnessing to the Gentiles within Paul's unique eschatological role. We think this an exaggeration. The intention was there prior to the visit to Jerusalem whether successful or not. There still seems to be justification for the concept represented by W.M. Ramsay of an imperial strategy in which cities and centres of population and influence had some importance for the mission. This is not a secularisation of the record but an acknowledgement of the humanity of the apostle. G. La Piana, *op. cit.*, p.401, remarks that "Until the fifth century the Christian religion was mainly a city religion; in the country its penetration was slow..." cf. J. Weiss, "The History of Primitive Christianity", 1937, 2, pp.864f; W. Wrede, "Paul", 1907, p.45; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), *op. cit.*, p.68; G.B. Caird, *op. cit.*, p.125. P.S. Minear, *op. cit.*, p.2, speaks of the "logistic reasons for writing to the Romans" and of Paul's "penchant for planning his travels well in advance". But see also W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.877, para. 767c.

2. F.J. Leenhardt, *op. cit.*, p.13, is reading in too much in speaking of a replacement of Jerusalem and its "ecclesiastical province" by Rome and its sphere of influence. We can assume that the normal intercourse between Jerusalem and Rome was reflected in contact between the Christians in both places. There is however no evidence for the existence at this stage of an authoritarian structure. Affection and a sense of debt to Jerusalem would exist and especially among Jewish Christians but there was no provincial system at this early date. cf. W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.871, para. 760e - 761a; A.D. Nock, "St. Paul", 1938, p.80.

# THE CHURCH AT ROME.

"The oldest certain witness to the existence of the Roman Church is the Epistle to the Romans itself".<sup>1.</sup> At the time of writing that Church was celebrated throughout the world (1:8; 16:19). It must have been in existence for some years as Paul declares that he has long intended to visit it (1:8-13; cf. Ac. 19:21). Its zeal and loyalty are commended (1:8ff). The cradle in which it was laid must be assumed to be the Jewish community in Rome.<sup>2.</sup> This began to form in the second century B.C.<sup>3.</sup> It was increased by the Palestinian captives brought back by Pompey after the capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C. By the time of Jesus the colony was well established and organised and was second only to those of Alexandria and Antioch. This alien community with its intense racial and religious consciousness kept in close touch with the homeland and a constant traffic took place between the two in both directions.

---

1. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.217.

2. cf. G.La Piana, op. cit., pp.341ff. He argues that the life and manners of the foreign multitudes in Rome during the early centuries of the empire throw much light on the circumstances of the Christian community. He estimates the number of Jews in Rome at about 50,000. (cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.11 and n2. T. Zahn, op. cit., p.434, reckons the Jewish population in Rome in 4 A.D. to be certainly "more than 30,000".) Piana gives factual information on which imaginative reconstruction can be made of the Jews' social, economic and religious life. (See p.341 n1 for references on the history of the Jews in Rome.) The similarities of the situation in multi-racial Rome to that of many American cities in the 1930's and later, and certain English cities in the 1960's and later is quite remarkable. This volume is valuable for the social background of the Roman Church. essay

3. G.La Piana, op.cit., p.344.

"The Roman Church did not have a founder in the same sense as did the Church in Ephesus or Corinth."<sup>1</sup> Paul himself is clearly not the founder. Peter cannot be considered seriously for the role.<sup>2</sup> No other apostle is a candidate for the honour. The Epistle itself gives no hint of the person or persons to whom the Church at Rome was first indebted. It is not difficult however to reconstruct the origins by inference and conjecture. The nuclear event at Pentecost must not be underestimated in this connection. It may well have sent the first Christians to Rome with a consequent spontaneous self-propagation.<sup>3</sup> Their admittedly scant knowledge would be increased by new arrivals both from Jerusalem and

1. T. Zahn, op. cit., p.427.

2. It is unlikely that Peter visited Rome before the date of Paul's Epistle. The traditions connecting Peter with the origin of the Church at Rome, either individually or jointly with Paul, are late and unreliable and should be regarded as an attempt to attribute an apostolic origin. cf. A.F.J. Klijn, op. cit., pp.74f; J. Weiss, "The History of Primitive Christianity", 1937, 2, pp.838f. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.6, writes, "No early authority claims that it was founded by Peter (though the evidence that he visited Rome is early and <sup>seems</sup> sound)..." There is no mention in the Epistle itself of contemporary work by Peter in Rome. He does not appear in the list of greetings in Chapter 16, assuming a Roman destination, nor is he mentioned in the later Epistles of Paul usually ascribed to the first Roman captivity. cf. G. Bornkamm's rejection (Australian Biblical Review, XI (1963) 5) of H. Lietzmann's view that Peter was in Rome very early.

3. Ac. 2:10 allows this inference, cf. B.M. Metzger, op. cit., p.209. F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.13 says, "It may be significant that these Roman visitors are the only European contingent to receive express mention among the pilgrims". H.L. Ellison, "The Mystery of Israel", 1968, p.23, suggests "almost immediately after the day of Pentecost". T. Zahn, op. cit., p.433 on the other hand designates the "Jews and proselytes from Rome" not as festival visitors but as residents. R.S.V. gives "and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes"; so also N.E.B. but omitting "and".

*the first*



from other evangelised parts. They had the Old Testament which they were learning to interpret in their own special way <sup>1.</sup> and they had the dynamic of the Spirit. The normal flow of travellers, soldiers, civil servants, merchants and slaves would reinforce the first nucleus. <sup>2.</sup> It thus seems highly probable that the date of origin was very early. <sup>3.</sup> We know nothing

1. The work of C.H. Dodd (see in particular: a. "The Foundations of Christian Theology", Theology To-Day, 7 (1950-51), 308-320, comprising material in number 4 of the Stone Lectures, later published in b. "According to the Scriptures", 1952, in which see his summing-up pp.126f; and c. "The Old Testament in the New", 1952) has thrown light on the understanding of the Old Testament among the first generation of Christians. He traces this back to an assumed instruction given by Jesus himself to his disciples. Dodd's theory of blocks of material or whole contexts on recognised themes, has replaced the earlier view of J. Rendel Harris who inferred the existence of compilations of texts in the form of <sup>(Testimonies, Part I 1916, Part II 1920)</sup> "Testimonies".

2. T.W. Manson, "Studies in the Gospels and Epistles", 1962, p.259 n1, makes interesting reference to one of the oldest Christian private letters from one Irenaeus, a seaman in a grain ship plying between Egypt and Italy, who visits the Christian community in Rome while his ship is in port.

3. E.H. Gifford, op. cit., p.6, quotes Tacitus (Annals 15:44) to the effect that, soon after the death of its founder, Christianity spread even to Rome. A. Wikenhauser, op. cit., p.399, says, "at a very early date". T. W. Manson, op. cit., p.259 affirms, "Somewhere about the same time that the new faith came to Macedonia, it must also have arrived in Rome, perhaps a little earlier...." E.F. Scott, "The Varieties of New Testament Religion", 1943, p.128, looks to the followers of Stephen - cf. B.M. Metzger, op. cit., p.209. T. Zahn, op. cit., p.433, surmises an early mission by Barnabas, cf. M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), op. cit., pp.16f: ".....there was a continual increase of traffic in consequence of the frequent movement of troops and transfer of officials. The importance of all that for spreading the Christian faith is obvious; and there is really no need to ask how the Roman Church could have originated. Tradespeople, slaves in an official's retinue may have taken Christianity to Rome even in the thirties and forties". A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.207, suggests that the Roman Church originated from migration from Palestine and Syria.

concrete about the numbers <sup>1.</sup> and organisation <sup>2.</sup> of the Roman Church at the time of Paul's writing. In the beginning a connection with the Jewish community through its synagogues is very likely.<sup>3.</sup>

1. H. Lietzmann, "The Beginnings of the Christian Church", 1937, p.171: "We have not the slightest information about the size of the (Christian mission) Churches..." J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.278. cf. "Christ and Israel", 1967, p.97, estimates the number of Gentile Churches in the East as very modest with membership counted in thousands rather than tens of thousands and that of Jewish Churches in hundreds rather than in thousands. He reckons an average of some two hundred members in the area between Jerusalem and Illyria. W. Wrede, op. cit., p.46, suggests between 100 and 150 in any one city. There is much conjecture in all such calculations. It seems reasonable however that the number of Christians in Rome would bear some relation to the size of the city, the extent of the Jewish population, the early date of origin and the scale of travel between Rome and other parts.

2. J.B. Lightfoot, "Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul", 1895, p.246, sees in πᾶσι (1:7) a possible allusion to the "extensive and straggling character of the Church of the metropolis". The background information given by G.La Piana, op. cit., suggests that we should envisage several congregations or groups. Small numbers in each of these, limited finance, lack of space for building (especially for foreign societies), and a tendency to associate according to occupation, racial origin, or place of residence in the city, would encourage formation of a plurality of Christian groups. J. Weiss, op. cit., 1, p.361, had already suggested so (and see his quotation from von Dobschütz, p.361 n91). P.S. Minear, op. cit., pp.ix, 7, 24, 27, 43, infers the existence of many house-churches in Rome and relates these to his contention that there were at least five distinguishable groups of Christians in terms of religious outlook. (cf. his earlier essay, "The Truth About Sin and Death", Interpretation, 7 (1953), 143ff where he identifies "three major groups".) cf. B.M. Metzger, op. cit., pp.209: "...the letter is not addressed to 'the Church at Rome' but to 'all God's beloved in Rome' a phraseology which suggests that their organisation was not compact or unified". Also cf. H.L. Ellison, op. cit., pp.24, 85. On the house-church see F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.16; B.M. Metzger, op. cit., p.233; J.B. Lightfoot, "The Epistles of St. Paul: Colossians and Philemon", 1875, pp.308f on Col. 4:15.

3. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.6, suggests the formation of a Christian synagogue within the general framework of the Jewish groups in the city. cf. W. Manson, "The Epistle to the Hebrews", 1951, p.39; A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.195. See G.La Piana, op. cit., p.352 n22, for a list of the Jewish synagogues in Rome.

The quotation from Suetonius<sup>1.</sup> (c. 120 A.D.) offers the first firm point in history after the Epistle itself and provides a connecting link with the independent account of Ac. 18:1f. It is highly probable that "Chrestus" therein refers to Christ.<sup>2.</sup> The probable date of the Claudius Edict is 49 A.D. This would carry the Roman Church back at least before that date. We assume therefore that the origin of the Roman Church was very early, non-apostolic, the result of incidental rather than official mission and that we should think of groups of Christians.

The membership of the Church or Churches at Rome in relation to Jewish or Gentile antecedents and predominance has been argued for long. A firm decision would help us to interpret the content of the Epistle on the principle that the content of a New Testament document is related to the historical situation. We may assume that the first Christians in Rome were Jewish.<sup>3.</sup> Some allowance may be made for a prosyletised element of pagan origin but this would be small. This Church would be fed from the congregations of the Jewish mission and the Gentile mission. The Gentile intake would increase with the passage of time.

1. "Vita Claudii", XXV, 2: "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit".

2. cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., pp.217f; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., pp.11f; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.6; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.14; G.B. Caird, op. cit., p.95 and n2, p.163; against cf. T. Zahn, op. cit., p.433. The reference can be understood as an error made in ignorance or as a possible confusion of the vowels "e" and "i" or as an assimilation to a Latin form.

3. cf. G. La Piana, "La Primitiva Comunità Cristiana di Roma e L'Epistola ai Romani", Ricerche Religiose, (May/July 1925), p.209 and n2. In this article, written in the same period as the author's larger work already mentioned, he allows his researches to throw their light on the circumstances of the Roman Church in relation to the Epistle. We are familiar with this article in a translation kindly supplied by Miss Roma Capaldi.

The followers of Stephen, Christians from the important city and Church of Syrian Antioch, converts from the Gentile Churches founded by Paul and others, are likely sources of recruitment.<sup>1</sup> The late fourth century Latin commentary by so-called Ambrosiaster hints at a Jewish dominance from the beginning.<sup>2</sup> The Edict of Claudius of 49 A.D. which expelled Jews from Rome suggests a close connection between the Christians and the Jewish Community. The situation behind the Edict would of course require time to mature. After 49 A.D. the balance in membership between Jew and Gentile would be significantly altered even if the Jews were banned only from Rome and not from Italy, or if leaders and activists alone were banished.<sup>3</sup> After the death of Claudius in 59 A.D., or perhaps at an earlier date if official control slackened with the passing of time,<sup>4</sup> the return of Jewish Christians would possibly present a crisis in the social dynamics of the Church.<sup>5</sup> Tensions would arise if they tried to resume a position formerly enjoyed. The date of such a situation might be correlated with information possessed by Paul,

---

1. It may be that in the beginning there was pressure on pagan converts to become Jews before admission to the Church. The point at which issues arising from the integration of Jew and Gentile became pressing cannot be fixed.

2. This is discussed by W. Manson, "Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)", "New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson 1893-1958", ed. A.J.B. Higgins, 1959, pp.150f. cf. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, *op. cit.*, pp.xxv, ci; A.F.J. Klijn, *op. cit.*, pp.75f. On Ambrosiaster see A. Souter, "The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul", 1927, pp.39ff.

3. So E. Haenchen quoted W. Marxsen, *op. cit.*, p.99.

4. cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.225 and n3, for a parallel situation.

5. T. Zahn, *op. cit.*, p.429, speaks of the "reconstruction of the Christian Church about 54...."

allowing for the time factor in the passage of news.<sup>1.</sup> Perhaps such a situation of readjustment underlies some of the content of the Epistle.<sup>2.</sup>

We can resolve the problem of the composition of the Roman Church in three ways.

1. Some argue for the dominance of Gentile Christians<sup>3.</sup> with appeal to the Gentile address of certain sections of the Epistle.<sup>4.</sup> We then have

1. Although Paul had never been to Rome the relative ease of travel and communication, (cf. W.R. Halliday, "The Pagan Background of Early Christianity", 1925, pp.64-104; J. Klausner, op. cit., pp.55f), together with his intense interest in all the Churches, suggests that Paul must have had considerable information concerning the Roman Church. This belief is strengthened if Chapter 16 is part of the original and is addressed to Rome. We know that Paul was in touch with other Christian communities. It seems very natural to suppose that he had lines of communication with people (eg. Aquila and Priscilla) who knew the Roman situation well. cf. P.S. Minear, op. cit., pp.20ff.

2. E. Trocme, "L'Épître aux Romains et la Methode Missionnaire de l'Apôtre Paul", N.T.S., 7 (1960-61), 148-153, finds the point of tension further back in a time before the Edict. At some point, sooner or later depending on local factors, the Christians in the mission congregations separated from, or were separated from, the synagogue. Trocme argues that the Epistle to the Romans refers to a situation of this kind which he regards as standard experience in the early mission.

3. Among whom are: C.K. Barrett, op. cit., pp.6f; A. Wikenhauser, op. cit., p.403; D. Guthrie, op. cit., pp.23f; P.S. Minear, op. cit., p.14; G. Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament", Australian Biblical Review, XI (1963), 5; J. Weiss, op. cit., 2, p.837; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.xxxiii; W. G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.218f; A.D. Nock, op. cit., pp.87; 208; H. Anderson, "The Historical Paul", New College Bulletin, 4 (Spring 1968), 14. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.201f, 205, maintains that the Roman Church was purely Gentile with no trace of Jewish Christian groups. We think this view untenable in view of the history of development which we have inferred. Here as at other points Munck tends to push his contention beyond the point at which we can happily follow him.

4. eg. 1:5-7, 13-15; 15:14-16.



difficulty in explaining the very strong Jewish colouring throughout and in particular the slabs of material of special Jewish interest such as 4:1ff; 3:21ff; 7:7ff and Chapters 9-11.

2. Others again argue for the dominance of Jewish Christians.<sup>1.</sup>

3. We may however refuse to accept an "either-or" decision. The fact that the Epistle itself can be quoted in either direction encourages this view.<sup>2.</sup> On T.W. Manson's theory of course the issue loses its force altogether because the content is then separated from a particular destination.<sup>3.</sup> According to P.S. Minear the key to the problem lies in a multiplicity of Churches or groups in Rome, any one of which could be characterised by a certain outlook or could be of mixed composition. We are able on this view to do full justice to those elements in the Epistle

1. This was F.C. Baur's position, of. "Paul, His Life and Works", 1876 2nd. Edition, 1, pp.308ff, elaborated by W. Mangold, "Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde", 1866. Also T. Zahn, op. cit., pp.421f; A. Sabatier, op. cit., pp.191f; E. Meyer, "Ursprünge und Anfänge des Christentums", 1923, iii, pp.465-7; and more recently by J. Klausner, op. cit., p.505; W. Manson, op. cit., pp.150ff (of. his "Epistle to the Hebrews", 1951, pp.172ff, 22f); T. Fahy, "St. Paul's Romans were Jewish Converts", Irish Theological Quarterly, 26 (1959), 182-191.

2. Good summaries of arguments pro and con are in A. Wikenhauser, op. cit., pp.403f; D. Guthrie, op. cit., pp.21-24. A.F.J. Klijn, op. cit., p.76, suggests a mixed composition with further precision impossible.

3. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.197ff (he adopts T.W. Manson's theory in its general outline) maintains that the Epistle cannot be used to answer the question. T.W. Manson appeals to Ephesians as a similar case. Romans is then seen as a summary and manifesto of the Gospel presented in writing to the Church at Rome and at Ephesus (and the Churches of Asia Minor); by word of mouth to the Church at Corinth (perhaps with a copy also); and then in person to the Church at Jerusalem at the last visit.

which have been claimed in support of a Jewish predominance or a Gentile predominance and to the oscillation between the two.<sup>1</sup> We think that the future of interpretation lies with this approach. Church situations then as now are usually complex.

#### THE PURPOSE OF ROMANS.

The diversity of opinion<sup>2</sup> regarding the purpose of the Epistle

---

1. P.S. Minear, op. cit., claims to identify at least five types of standpoint in the Roman Church. He assigns partisan labels to these but without assuming too rigid an organisation. They are: 1. the weak in faith who condemn the strong in faith; 2. the strong in faith who scorn the weak in faith; 3. the vacillators; 4. the weak in faith who do not condemn the strong; 5. the strong in faith who do not despise the weak. Paul's problem is then to move groups 1. and 2. into groups 4. and 5. and to convince group 3. Minear reviews the Epistle in this light and assigns the address of each main section to one or more of these factions. He says however, "It is almost certain that Gentile Christians were in the majority among the churches of Rome and that this letter is more strongly slanted towards them". (p.14.) We prefer to assert the multiplicity of groups without further analysis but if pressed we would affirm a Jewish preponderance from our reconstruction of the historical development and the massive Jewish interest of so much of the Epistle. cf. G. La Piana, "La Primitiva Comunità Cristiana di Roma e L'Epistola ai Romani", Ricerche Religiose, (May-July 1925), pp.209ff, in which three main groups are identified: the main one insists on law and privilege; the second is ascetic in emphasis; the third is a mixture of Jew and Gentile and intolerant of the others. cf. also A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.208, who asserts the existence of a multiplicity of smaller and larger groups and of different points of view; and E.E. Ellis, "Paul and His Co-Workers", N.T.S., 17 (1970-71), 448 n7, 449.

2. The Reformers' emphasis on Romans as a doctrinal exposition of the faith echoes the patristic period in which, as early as the Muratorian Fragment (c.170 A.D.), an exegetical and Christological interpretation is suggested. F.C. Baur claimed Romans in the service of his dialectical understanding of the primitive Christian history based on the Hegelian scheme. The issue then becomes the relationship of Judaism and heathenism to each other and of the two to Christianity and Chapters 9-11 are the heart of the Epistle. The recent attack on Baur's position by J. Munck also sees Chapters 9-11 as primary but in a quite different context. The scheme of the Epistle is subordinated to the final vindication of God's cause by the bringing in of both Gentile and Jew and in that order. W. Manson, op. cit., subsumes the whole Epistle under the righteousness of God with reference to salvation, history and conduct. A. Nygren gives a rousing eschatological

is itself significant. It suggests that it is an error of judgement to single out one sole purpose and then place the whole work under this one category. Classic works in whatever field are simply not amenable to such over-simplification. A broader approach is called for.

The immediate purpose lies on the surface of the Epistle (1:10-15; 15:14-33), in the reference to Paul's projected visit to Spain<sup>1</sup> and his hope of help from the brethren at Rome. In this interest they must know where he stands - within the faith common to them both.<sup>2</sup> But this missionary and personal motive does not wholly explain this formidable document. A lesser communication would have served such a limited purpose. Why then the Romans we know? We must allow for two factors.

1. The personal factor is important. The fierce conflict in which Paul had engaged with Jews and with Judaizing Christians is reflected

(cont'd) interpretation in which 5:12-21 is heavily stressed. O. Michel sees it as an explicitly didactic letter giving Paul's apologia and confronting both Jew and pagan with the Gospel exegetically demonstrated. F.J. Leenhardt makes what he calls a "genetic" approach, seeing the Epistle as an interpretation of the Church at the point of its originating situation. W. Marxsen locates the chief purpose in the address in the closing section to the weak and the strong. P.S. Minear finds the centre of gravity in the need for a more obedient faith in the Roman Church. There is much to be said for many "views" of Romans. We echo Minear's modest admission (op. cit., p.ix) that Romans is too deep to plumb. Yet for that very reason we must keep on trying.

1. And perhaps to Gaul and even Britain - cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.52; J. Weiss, op. cit., 1, p.359. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.14 writes, "Paul never wrote, so far as we know, except in regard to essential and immediate tasks; he always took up his pen under the pressure of the urgencies of his mission".

2. cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., pp.220ff, in which he manages to express clearly that Romans is a personal theological confession yet not a general theological compendium. T.W. Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others", Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, 1962, ed. M. Black, pp.225ff, also brings out this aspect well.



in Galatians.<sup>1.</sup> At the time of writing Romans the heat was out of the issue for Paul. Perhaps the writing of Galatians helped to expend the heat. The Apostle was able to reflect and pronounce in a quieter state of mind and with a different frame of reference. Yet at the same time every pronouncement of substance reflects the milieu of the one who makes it. Paul has lived so long and so intensely vis a vis the Jewish alternative to "grace through faith" and the Judaizing supplement to "faith alone", he can only express his message as circumstances have taught him. We all know best the way we have come. There is therefore a strong doctrinal content in Romans with an inevitable polemical background.

2. The destination of Romans is important. More note should be taken of the situation at Rome than has been customary in many quarters. At the same time we should not in any way reduce the emphasis on the relevance of Paul's past to the content. Specific reference to the destination is not made to the same extent as in 1 Cor. but it is far from negligible.<sup>2.</sup>

---

1. We date Galatians very near Romans. In a sense Galatians is a sketch which Romans turns into a picture - cf. A. Sabatier, op. cit., pp.155, 209; F.C. Baur, op. cit., 1, p.308; E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.357f; E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, p.124.

2. The contributions of G. La Piana and P.S. Minear in particular have led us to this conclusion. W. Marxsen also stresses the concrete situation at Rome seeing the address to the "weak" and the "strong" as the climax of the whole and as related to a problem which was also prominent in Jerusalem. We think this is too small a superstructure for so massive a foundation. See rather A. Nygren, op. cit., pp.411ff and F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., pp.12f.

We cannot specify in what exact proportions we should assess these factors. The reader will in any case bring his own presuppositions and to some extent find what he wants to find, but we may be sure that only a broad approach will meet the case.

#### THE STRUCTURE OF ROMANS.

We shall now indicate very briefly what we consider to be the basic design of the Epistle.

The Whole. Chapters 1-16. "The plan of the Epistle is simple".<sup>1.</sup> We reply - in the way the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven is simple, if you are a Beethoven. The genius underlying the Epistle is evidenced by the many attempts to schematise it. We regard the common division into three main parts as sound, viz. Chapters 1-8; 9-11; 12-16.<sup>2.</sup> We thus have three manageable units within a work which as a whole is somewhat overwhelming. We assume that these divisions bespeak the need for pause for the writer as well as for the reader.<sup>3.</sup> There is however no question of any "part" standing on its own in isolation from the rest.

1. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.24.

2. 1:1-17 is preface as 15:14-16:27 is postscript. N.E.B. heads these divisions: 1-8: "The Gospel according to Paul"; 9-11: "The Purpose of God in History"; 12-16: "Christian Behaviour".

3. Some, like F.J. Leenhardt, prefer a fourfold division: the theme - the Gospel of justification preached by Paul as far as Spain; 1:18-5:11 - its theological aspect; 5:12-8:39 - its anthropological aspect; 9:1-11:36 - its historical aspect; 12:1-15:33 - its ethical aspect. We note also Leenhardt's claim to identify two parallel structures within the homogeneity of the Epistle, each comprising five passages, the second set answering to the first. O. Michel makes the break at 5:1, giving Chapters 1-4; 5-8; 9-11; 12-15:13. W. Marxsen follows through from 3:21 to 8:39. F.F. Bruce deals with Chapters 1-11 as a whole and there is much to be said for this. The Chapter headings in K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, repay study. A. Nygren's play on 1:17 in formulating his

The Part. Chapters 1-8. We have a particular interest in the first eight Chapters which we shall sketch very lightly.

1. 1:1-17. The Epistle opens with a rich introduction of the writer and his message comprising two units. T.W. Manson calls the first the "prescript"<sup>1</sup> and describes it as "a single sentence extending over seven verses (1-7) heavily encrusted with doctrinal embellishments, so that it becomes a miniature exposition of the Faith in itself". The second unit, vv8-17, forms a transition to the first main theme. 1:16f is a classic summary of the Gospel theme.<sup>2</sup>

2. 1:18-3:20. The "bad news" which is precursor to the "good news" is set out at length. The complex of law, sin, wrath, judgement makes daunting reading. In interpreting opyo we should go beyond an impersonal "principle of retribution"<sup>3</sup> to a personal view of wrath expressed as acts of judgement. The argument here is very carefully

(cont'd) outline is impressive and has the virtue of making clear the unity of the Epistle. T.W. Manson, "Peake 1962", p.940, para. 815c, writes "Paul clearly indicates the major pauses in his exposition by doxologies or benedictions which occur at 11:33-6, where the doctrinal section(1:18-11:32) ends; at 15:13, the end of the ethical section; at 15:33 at the end of the plans for future work; and at three different points in Ch.16, vv20, 24, 27.... These are natural stopping-places..."

1. "Studies in the Gospels and Epistles", ed. M. Black, 1962, p.227.

2. C.K. Barrett, "New Testament Essays", 1972, pp.116ff, argues that Paul's statement in 1:16 is closely related to a very early stage of the tradition which appears in Mk. 8:38 and its parallel and related verses. This belongs to "one sector of the tradition of the teaching of Jesus" (p.132). 1:1-16 is thus a connecting point between Paul and Jesus and indicates that their teaching was essentially related. 1:16 should not be understood psychologically as putting on a bold front in face of the imperial capital. It rather expresses solidarity with the early Christian communities which framed their essential discipline in terms of loyalty to Jesus. The (Christological) doctrine of justification in 1:16 thus corresponds to the centrality of the figure of Jesus in the early tradition. On 1:16a, cf. K. Grayston, "'Not Ashamed of the Gospel'. Romans 1, 16a and the Structure of the Epistle". Texte und Untersuchungen, 87 (1964), 569ff.

3. as eg. C.H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp.20ff; cf. 1:18, N.E.B.

compounded<sup>1.</sup> in order to reveal man to himself as a sinner.<sup>2.</sup> The Gospel is thus offered in the first of its two indivisible parts, judgement and mercy.<sup>3.</sup>

3. 3:21-26. The grace of God in the Lord Jesus Christ is set forth in language richly loaded from Israel's past. The law-court, the slave-market, the Temple are all invoked. The salvation present is tied to the salvation past. The important concepts of righteousness and justification, of God justifying and justified, all appear.

4. 4:1-25. Here we meet the preoccupation of Romans with the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament<sup>4.</sup> in the person of Abraham "the righteous man of the OT",<sup>5.</sup> kith and kin to the righteous man of the new aeon, witness to and sharer in the same grace. The then offered word and the then receptive faith are used to illumine the Christian present. Not only is Abraham in his own person held up as the prototype of faith but the relevance of the Old Testament as the witness to faith is also emphasised.<sup>6.</sup> A perceptive analysis of the psychology of faith is to be

1. The pagan man is condemned (1:18-32); the respectable man is condemned (2:1-16); the representative religious man is condemned (2:17-3:8); summary and conclusion of universal condemnation (3:9-20).

2. cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.17.

3. In the course of public worship in Edinburgh Reinhold Niebuhr spoke of the God "whose judgement humbles our pride and whose mercy heals our despair".

4. cf. K. Barth, op. cit., p.11.

5. ibid. p.53.

6. W. Marxsen, op. cit., p.105. cf. A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.29, who says that in rejecting the Law Paul "appeals to an earlier springtime, the Call of Abraham".

found here.<sup>1.</sup>

5. 5:1-11; 12-21. In the first part<sup>2.</sup> the far horizons of salvation are glimpsed and the strongest words of the Gospel appear. The use of καὶ ὅτε is striking. The high doctrine is firmly tied to the realities of life. The nuclear core of the Gospel - Christ in his Death - is presented. In 5:12-21<sup>3.</sup> we note in particular: the concept of solidarity; the two orders of Adam and Christ and the overlap between them; the repetition which emphasises the measure by which the one order exceeds the other.<sup>4.</sup>

6. 6:1-14. The key phrase is "union with Christ" (N.E.B. vv3, 5, 11, 23), the converse of which is death to sin. The exposition proceeds with

1. Paul has no "psychology of faith" in the modern sense. He is concerned with objective situations such as that in which man stands before God and that created by the Gospel offer, rather than with subjective, psychological mechanisms. Here however in this Christian midrash, we have an exception to the rule in the articulation of Abraham's faith. C.A. Anderson Scott, "Christianity According to St. Paul", 1927, p.142, writes, "...there is no part of his vocabulary which the Apostle uses with less scientific precision than the terms which reflect his psychology".

2. A. Feuillet, "Le Plan Salvifique de Dieu d'Après l'Épître aux Romains", Revue Biblique, 57 (1950), 356 nl, affirms that the vocabulary of 5:1-11 indicates that the passage forms the conclusion of the preceding remarks.

3. A. Nygren, op. cit., p.27, cf. p.20, describes 5:12ff as "the high point of Romans". Here "all that precedes and all that follows spread out before us in one inclusive view". Nygren insists on the central significance of 5:12-21 and uses the concept of the two aeons as a comprehensive category.

4. The N.E.B. brings this out well.

the concept of baptismal incorporation and the supplementing images of vv3-6. Emphasis is placed on the Death of Christ (with its Resurrection consequence) which is both productive of and pattern for the Christian life. The salvation indicative is shown to underlie the moral imperative.

7. 6:15-7:25. The train of thought is expressed in two sets of two. In 6:15-23<sup>1</sup> we have the two masters and in 7:1-6 we have the two husbands. Then in 7:7-25 the two sets of two are expanded into a multi-character dramatisation.

8. 8:1-39. 8:1-4 is a tight summary of what precedes, followed by the high doctrine of the Holy Spirit of which, to our surprise perhaps, so little mention has hitherto been made. The eschatological terms are prominent throughout. The "golden chain"<sup>2</sup> is described and the invincible love affirmed lyrically.

1. The objection of 6:1ff is resumed in 6:15.

2. We have not found this apt description of 8:29f earlier than Matthew Henry (died 1714). G.B. Caird, op. cit., p.139, comments regarding 1 Cor. 13 and 15, Phil. 2, and Rom. 8 and 11:33ff, that "the theologian gives place to the poet".



THE CONCEPT OF LAW IN ROMANS.  
PRIOR TO CHAPTER 7.

CHAPTER 2.

We will now build a bridge from the general introduction to the detailed consideration of 7:7ff by reviewing the concept of law in Chapters 1-6, before it becomes the explicit and major interest in 7:7ff. The law does not burst into view suddenly in Chapter 7 but has been in the background throughout.

In the earlier Chapters Paul polarises the spiritual situation. God is at one end of the line and man is at the other. Between these two poles there is a flow of energy, beginning always from the positive which lies with God. Paul's thought is thus essentially antithetical.<sup>1</sup> This antithesis can be expressed in terms of a fundamental opposition between law and Gospel. It is important however to understand law within this antithesis as 7:7ff in particular present it. It is not law as it comes from the hand of God direct but as it has been usurped by sin. Alongside the primary philosophical monism of Paul's Hebraic tradition there is thus a secondary dualism in which he compares and contrasts two great systems which are polar opposites. They comprise man under

---

1. The use of antithesis as a characteristic of Paul's thought is often recognised. H.J. Cadbury, "Overconversion in Paul's Churches", The Joy of Study, ed. S.E. Johnson, 1951, p.47, writes, "To judge from his letters Paul's mind was antithetic in structure just as his speech tends to elaborated antithesis". J. Klausner, op. cit., p.423 refers to Paul as a "man of polarity". cf. also A. Sabatier, op. cit., pp.68f; W. Wrede, op. cit., p.39; J. Weiss, op. cit., 1, p.411; C.A. Anderson Scott, op. cit., p.149; R.M. Grant, "A Historical Introduction to the New Testament", 1963, pp.380ff; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), op. cit., p.102 (cf. pp.40, 62, 65); H.J. Schoeps, "Paul", 1961, p.49. An extreme view is expressed in a summary of A. Meyer by V.P. Furnish, "The Jesus-Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann", B.J.R.L., 47, 1965, 353: "...Paul's pathological tendency to see everything in sharp contrasts".



law-usurped-by-sin over against the Gospel or the Spirit or grace or Christ. We may also speak of man in the Old Age and man in the New Age. This basic antithesis<sup>1</sup> reflects Paul's personal experience with its before and after, the dividing line being the encounter with the Risen Lord. The ultimate basis of the antithesis is thus Christological, a sphere or order of which Jesus Christ is the centre is opposed to one of which he is not the centre.

We must do more than simply count the occurrences of νέμω. We have to understand the contexts within which it is used and the flow of the argument as it proceeds to Chapter 7. We shall now do this and for our present purpose it will be convenient to divide Chapters 1-6 into six sections.

---

1. A. Nygren, op. cit., p.46: "Thus in the very first verse of this epistle we encounter the letter's basic juxtaposition of law and gospel which, from one point of view, is the theme of Romans"; also ibid. p.66: "...for Paul the gospel always stands in inescapable relation to the law. Wherever the gospel is, the law always stands in the background". We admit the risks attached to every attempt to produce a final categorisation of Paul's theology. Some classifications which have been advanced are: the two kingdoms - of God and Satan (T.W. Manson); salvation (C.A. Anderson Scott; A.M. Hunter); Paul's Pharisaism (W.D. Davies; F.C. Grant); union with Christ (J.S. Stewart); man's reliance on himself over against his reliance on God (C.F.D. Moule); the concept of boasting (R. Bultmann); new life in Christ (J. Weiss); redemption (W. Wrede); eschatological mysticism (A. Schweitzer). D.E.H. Whiteley avoids any comprehensive category and deals with leading terms in Paul both separately and in their inter-relations. E.F. Scott presents a cluster of concepts - grace, freedom, the Spirit, union with Christ.

1. 1:1-17. The emphasis is heavily on the positive side of the basic antithesis.<sup>1</sup> Paul was formerly a man of the law.<sup>2</sup> He is now a man of the Gospel in the service of the Gospel writing about the Gospel to a Gospel people. He is careful at the outset to connect the Gospel to the prophetic tradition and the sacred corpus. The two belong together as promise to fulfilment.<sup>3</sup> The old and the new are thus organically connected.<sup>4</sup> The unity and continuity between the old covenant and the new are of first importance.<sup>5</sup> If we take 1:16f as in a sense the text<sup>6</sup>.

1. Making allowance for vv8-15 which present material of a neutral character expressing personal thoughts and feelings by way of establishing communication.

2. There is a possible word play on ἀποπλεγμένως and ἀπλετικός. cf. A. Nygren, op. cit., p.46.

3. J. Denney, "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans", The Expositor, 6th Series (1901), 3, p.441: "Paul is aware that revelation from first to last is a unity, and therefore consistent with itself. It is one God who is revealing himself in it all along..... The Old Testament and the New Testament are at bottom one, and will stand or fall together".

4. A. Nygren, op. cit., p.167 writes regarding Chapter 4, "The entire history of God's saving work is, for Paul, a great unity. There is an inner unity between the old covenant and the new". cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.35: "In a sense there is nothing new about the gospel, as the whole letter will show...."; also p.36: "The gospel represents, not a break with the past, but a consummation of it"; and p.19: "Thus the young church is not a different church from the ancient church"; and p.128: "In short, the faith of Abraham is essentially the same as our own faith, because its object is the same".

5. cf. 3:30f; 4:1-25; 10:4, 6-10; Gal 3:8.

6. cf. C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.29; A. Nygren, op. cit., p.23.

of the Epistle, it affirms the tie between the old and the new. A true understanding of the function of the law can arise only by maintaining the connection.<sup>1</sup> The old and the new both lie within the self-revelation of God. The law originates in and belongs to the former aeon over against which, and yet arising out of it because God is in both, we have the events which centre in Jesus. He who was not ashamed of the law is now not ashamed of the Gospel for ἐν νόμῳ and no longer ἐν νόμῳ is the righteousness of God revealed.

2. 1:18-3:20. In the negative aspect of the antithesis we learn the "bad news". A complex of ideas appears comprising sin, law, wrath and death which describes the human situation to which the Gospel answers. We must see the law as part of this complex with no independent existence.<sup>2</sup>

1. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.29: "It was inconceivable that God's Anointed should appear outside the context of messianic prophecy, where alone there existed a vocabulary suitable for describing him. Further, it was impossible that he should be understood except against the background of law".

2. The four factors in the complex of 1:18-3:20 have a certain correspondence to the four characters in the dramatisation of 7:7ff. Sin, law, death, appear in 7:7ff also and essentially in their inter-relations. Wrath does not appear. We find instead its polar opposite in the grace which is implied in the thanksgiving which names Christ. The replacement is significant of the different standpoint from which 7:7ff is written. A. Nygren unifies this complex as "the Old Aeon" from which we are removed by virtue of Jesus Christ. We leave behind the whole complex and not one part only. Thus Paul can argue in Chapter 7 regarding the law what he has already argued in Chapter 6 regarding sin - to be dead to the one is to be dead to the other.

1:32 affirms the principle whose outward expression is catalogued in the preceding verses. The Sinai<sup>1.</sup> is known by all men who therefore stand under obligation to God and in a relation of responsibility. Man's disobedience to God's decree is connected with death, which should be understood in the most comprehensive sense including the eschatological. These three emphases - divine decree, human responsibility, necessary consequences - are the recurring theme of this section. Paul thus establishes universal sin and guilt in order to affirm universal salvation.<sup>2.</sup>

The function of the law is variously expressed.

a). The law belongs to the sphere of revelation. The distinction between "general" and "special" revelation<sup>3.</sup> can be helpfully applied here. In the case of the Gentiles there is a general revelation, in the case of the Jews there is a special revelation and both are connected with the self-revelation of God. This connection will be vigorously maintained in Chapter 7. We cannot therefore dismiss the law as wholly

1. R.S.V. reads "decree"; N.E.B. "the just decree".

2. The universal categories which characterise Paul's outlook are both the logical outcome of his Hebrew monotheism and a necessary inference from his encounter with the Risen Lord. E.F. Scott, "Paul's Epistle to the Romans", 1947, p.22, says hyperbolically, "In almost every verse of the Epistle there is some word that denotes totality". P.S. Minear, op. cit., p.45 n4, relates the universals in Romans to the polemical situation and the need for the partisan groups to embrace a wider view. J. Denney, op. cit., 3, p.284, shows well the connection between the universality of sin, law and Gospel. He remarks (op. cit., 4, p.91) on the inseparable association of faith and "all" in Romans. cf. W. Marxsen, op. cit., p.102; K. Barth, "All: A Sermon", Interpretation, 14 (1960), 64-69.

3. cf. E. Brunner, "The Mediator", 1934, pp.21-41.

negative. There is in fact an essential paradox in Paul's understanding of the law. It belongs to the sphere of God's self-revelation, therefore we must speak of it in the old aeon positively as well as negatively. We must also in some sense carry over the law into the new aeon of the Spirit, so that the life of faith is lived in true freedom but also under the rule of God, both at the same time. Thus the law is "established"<sup>1</sup> (3:21) and it is "fulfilled"<sup>2</sup> by Christ (10:4).

1. C.F.D. Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul", Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox, ed. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, R.R. Niebuhr, 1967, p.404, quotes R.T. Brooks ("Person to Person", 1964, p.66) that we are "ruled more firmly by the pardon than we ever were by the law".

2. Christ as the τέλος of the law (10:4) should be understood in a double sense as termination or end and also as goal or fulfilment. So F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.203; F.C. Grant, "Roman Hellenism and the New Testament", 1962, p.147; A.R. Vidler, "Christ's Strange Work", 1963, pp. 78-80; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.197; P. Benoit, "La Loi et la Croix D'Après Saint Paul (Rom 7:7-8:4)", Revue Biblique, 47 (1938), 502. C.E.B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law", S.J.T., 17 (1964) 49ff, rejects "termination" and argues for "goal". E.H. Gifford, op. cit., p.183, rejects "goal" and argues for "terminus" and "end". cf. R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law", Essays: Philosophical and Theological, 1955, pp.36-66, for an extended consideration and his conclusion (p.54) that Christ is the end of a life which, out of the need for recognition, seeks to establish its own righteousness.

b). The law is descriptive. God has revealed himself to all men. His revealed nature is exclusive of that which is not in keeping with himself. The law describes what man is and does when he lives in a right relation with God. The precepts of the law amplify and extend the divine word, "I the Lord am holy therefore...". The sordid behaviour patterns which figure in 1:18-3:20 acquire their evil character over against the nature of God as revealed. In short, an act or attitude is what it is, by its relation to God. The definitive or descriptive process is performed by the law, the classic expression of which in the Hebrew tradition is the Ten Words.

c). The law is prescriptive. It does not simply state the fact but brings this to bear on man as an awareness of obligation and hence of guilt. The law applies the revelation in the form of prescriptions both positive ("Thou shalt...") and negative ("Thou shalt not..."). These are shown to exist in two directions, in Israel specifically as the Mosaic Law,<sup>1</sup> and outside Israel in conscience (2:12-16). The prescriptions in either form are valid because both relate to God.

We note two further matters in this section. First the law is considered in relation to circumcision (2:25ff) which is the outward

---

1. The Torah of course embraces more than moral precepts. There are ceremonial and judicial elements. While Paul may focus interest on one particular aspect if such a course suits his purpose, the Law is essentially a unity for him. cf. R. Bultmann, "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961, p.135, who stresses that the law which is the claim of God cannot be separated from history and from the people of God. See especially G.F. Moore, "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim", 1927, 1, p.263, on the comprehensive nature of the Torah. cf. P. Carrington, "The Primitive Christian Catechism", 1940, pp.3ff.



sign of the old covenant; in relation to works (2:13) which are the outward expression of the inward constraint; and in relation to boasting (2:17, 23) which indicates a person's ultimate dependence. Then matters are touched on which will appear later in the Epistle, in particular in 3:20, which will occupy us later. The important question in 3:1 is developed at length in Chapters 9-11.

3. 3:21-31. The positive aspect is resumed.<sup>1</sup> Three assertions are significant for us.

a). The righteousness of the new aeon is manifested Χωρίς νόμου. 3:28 clarifies the point - Χωρίς έργων νόμου. In a law-based soteriology fulfilment of the law constitutes a claim on God who acknowledges achievement by declaring a person to be in the right.<sup>2</sup> In the era of grace on the other hand the declaration precedes achievement.<sup>3</sup> In 3:21 we are concerned with law as a system of salvation and in this sense Paul attacks the law unsparingly.

b). At the same time "the law and the prophets bear witness to it" (3:21). Thus the all-important unity and continuity between the two covenants are affirmed. The paradox must be maintained and so Paul speaks both negatively and positively of the law.

1. The transition is indicated by νυν δε, 3:21.

2. cf. C.F.D. Moule, op. cit., p.393, who uses "legalism" as a "shorthand" signifying "the intention to claim God's favour by establishing one's own rightness". See also G.B. Caird, "Principalities and Powers", 1956, p.41.

3. F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.102: "...God pronounces a man righteous at the beginning of his course, not at the end of it".

c). 3:31 is of special significance. Paul aims to establish the true relationship between law and Gospel. In a sense faith does indeed overthrow the law when the latter is understood as a system of salvation. But such a view of the law is a misunderstanding from the beginning. It was never intended to be a system of salvation. Law rightly understood is established by faith. There is thus a positive relationship between law and the righteousness which is based on faith. The effect of such an understanding is to exclude the boasting of human pride. In the case of the law this is done by prescribing what is impossible of fulfilment. In the case of the righteousness which is by faith it is done positively by a displacement in which the object of boasting becomes Jesus Christ. But Paul writes in a way which gives a superficial appearance of contradiction. This is due to some extent to a lack of sophisticated vocabulary.<sup>1</sup> Thus while the law is abolished in the one sense, Christians are still under moral obligation.<sup>2</sup> When this is expressed

1. C.E.B. Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p.55, maintains that Paul suffered a disadvantage in his discussion of the law compared with the modern writer, in that he lacked a "word-group to denote 'legalism', 'legalist' and 'legalistic'". This results in a certain imprecision so that what Paul says in a strictly limited sense about a misunderstanding of the law may be misread as applying to the law in general. cf. C.F.D. Moule, *op. cit.*, pp.391f.

2. On this important matter cf. in particular C.F.D. Moule, *op. cit.*, who insists that Paul, like Jesus, attacks legalism but affirms law. Moule works out the logic of Christian obligation. Also cf. A.R. Vidler, *op. cit.*, pp.16, 30, 33, 66, 69, 113; G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, 1, p.268; A. Sabatier, *op. cit.*, p.306; W. Wrede, *op. cit.*, p.136; J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.252ff; R.M. Grant, *op. cit.*, p.389; T.W. Manson, "Ethics and the Gospel", 1960, p.18; K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, pp.88ff; R. Bring, "The Message to the Gentiles", *Studia Theologica*, 19-20 (1965-66), 36f, 41; R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law", *Essays: Philosophical and Theological*, 1955, p.45, also "Paul", *Existence and Faith*, 1961, pp.135ff; P. Benoit,

in terms of the person of God it means that God is just when he justifies. The thought of an inward moral constraint is developed in Chapter 6 through the concept of union with Christ and in Chapter 8 by the concept of life in the Spirit and in the paraenetic section of the Epistle which begins at 12:1.<sup>1</sup>

4. 4:1-25. Paul illustrates the relationship between grace and faith from the classic figure of Abraham, with a glimpse at David, in an effort to establish his Christian conclusion from accepted ground. Abraham belongs at one and the same time to the two aeons, historically to the old, proleptically to the new. The pattern of righteousness in Abraham is one of promise, faith and obedience. Paul thus goes behind the concept of law in the case of Abraham whose faith was prior both to the law and to the later sign of the law which is circumcision. It was also independent of works which are law observances. This independence of law is emphasised by the psychological analysis in vv18-21. The common factor between Abraham and the Christian is shown to be the fact that each builds on a word from God.<sup>2</sup> For the Christian this "word"

---

(cont'd) op. cit., 508 nl on 667-670 ; C.K. Barrett, "From First Adam to Last", 1962, pp.67, 80. J. Denney has a strong sense of the permanence of the law, cf. op. cit., 3, pp.175, 178ff; and 4, p.94 where he speaks of Christ dying in order to establish the difference between good and evil which the law seeks to define.

1. cf. 1 Cor. 9:21; Gal 3:21; Mt. 5:17f.

2. cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.42; A.S. Peake, "The Quintessence of Paulinism", B.J.R.L., 4 (1917-18), 305f.

is the event of Jesus Christ which culminates in his Death and Resurrection.

5. 5:1-21. We pass over vv1-11 in which the whole emphasis lies on the positive side of the basic antithesis.<sup>1</sup> In vv12-21, which have figured so prominently in the history of Dogma, Paul uses the largest brush available.<sup>2</sup> He interprets history in the most comprehensive categories: there are two aeons; there are two representative men; there are two ultimate categories for understanding the human situation; there is Adam and there is Christ. There is no psychologising or introspection here. There is also no mention of the Spirit. There does not need to be, the scope of the argument is set within chosen limits. This is a philosophy of history or rather an account of salvation history presented biblically (which means in terms of the Old Testament) and in particular Christologically. Certain concepts attach to the two aeons: to the former sin and death; to the latter grace and life. The problem is - how does the law fit into this grand scheme? It does not set up a third aeon. Moses does not stand beside Adam and Christ. There are only two ages. The law "slipped in alongside"<sup>3</sup> what was

1. These verses establish the present possession of the eschatological blessing. Note the triad faith, hope and love, well brought out in the N.E.B.

2. There is a striking contrast between the careful cameo of 4:16ff and the wide canvas of 5:12ff. Paul can ring the changes in his presentation.

3. παρεῖχθη 5:20. cf. C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.117: "The law took its subordinate place"; W. Wrede, op. cit., p.129, on the giving of the law to Moses by angels as a sign of its inferior position; G.B. Caird, op. cit., pp.47ff.

already there to play a subordinate role in a situation which it did not create. This is clarified by pointing to the relation between the law and sin. Sin was already in the world before the giving of the law which means in Paul's chosen terms, between Adam and Moses. In the absence of law however sin was not "counted". The fundamental situation was not altered with the giving of the law. It was still the age of sin and death but with the addition of the law sin became transgression. Men who had been sinners all along in relation to God became transgressors in relation to the law. It was therefore the function of the law to turn sin into transgression,<sup>1</sup> thus clarifying and at the same time aggravating the situation already existing.

Over against the "Adam series" of sin, death, law and transgression, Paul sets the greater "Christ series" of obedience, life, grace and righteousness. These are related quite disproportionately, the balance tilting heavily in favour of Christ and his work, the one for the many. The difference is qualitative rather than quantitative. In other words we are not concerned with a prospect of amelioration but with the mystery of incarnation and redemption.

6. 6:1-23. The new situation arising out of Christ and his work is discussed in two directions. In vv1-14 he relates it to the possibility of continuing in sin and draws the necessary inferences

---

1. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.118: "...for only law can turn invisible sin into visible transgression", and "From First Adam to Last", 1962, p.15, "...law is not necessary to the existence but only for the assessment of sin".

from the transition from law to grace. In vv15-23 he deals with the problem of obligation to God under grace and interprets the new liberty as obedience. The pivot on which his argument turns is the Death of Christ and our consequent union with him.<sup>1.</sup>

What has been said in Chapter 6 on the basis of the Death of Christ and our union with him is repeated in Chapter 7, with certain differences, with reference to the law. Once the basic lesson has been learned, viz. the Death of Christ and our union with him, we can draw the necessary conclusions in whatever direction may be required.

We have now seen how the concept of law is embedded in the general context of Chapters 1-6, emerging explicitly at various points. It must do so because it belongs to the nuclear thought of Paul who works with a fundamental antithesis which may be variously expressed - the old aeon and the new; representative Adam and representative Christ; law-usurped-by-sin over against the Gospel or grace or the Spirit.

---

1. The main subject of Chapter 6 is not baptism, which is viewed here as a point of connection with Christ in his Death, but the Death of Christ and our union with him. Sin is only the secondary subject although the form of presentation may lead us into the error of seeing sin as the main interest.



THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT OF 7:7-25.CHAPTER 3.

We shall first investigate the relationships of 7:1-6. This is not an independent unit but has the closest connections with Chapter 6, with 7:7ff and with 8:1ff. This dual relationship backward and forward reflects the close knit character of the Epistle as a whole.

1. 7:1-6 and Chapter 6.

The connections between 7:1-6 and the previous Chapter are so close we could in fact organise the text to make 6:1-7:6 stand on its own. We prefer however to regard Chapter 7 as a unit in two parts which are 7:1-6 and 7:7-25. We admit that there is an arbitrary element in this division but we must draw the line somewhere and there are also advantages. In this way we retain the familiar Chapter divisions which have a certain expediency. We also preserve the forward connections equally with the backward, so that 7:1-6 not only forms the conclusion of the previous argument but also provides, especially in vv5-6, the "text" of 7:7ff.<sup>1</sup> 6:15a, which itself resumes the question of 6:1, lays down the important principle on conclusion of the argument of 6:1-14 that it is not consistent with grace for Christians to continue in sin. This is followed by a digression in 6:15-23 in which the false inference that grace gives licence to sin is dealt with. 7:1 returns to the point made in 6:14b - "not under law but under grace".

---

1. cf. U. Luz, "Zum Aufbau von Röm 1-8", Theologische Zeitschrift, 25 (1969), 176ff.

We can establish the backward connections in detail. The conjunction  $\eta$  in 7:1 points to the connection with the preceding. It should be translated "or" and not omitted as in A.V., R.S.V., and N.E.B. The  $\eta$   $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$  recalls 6:3 where this interesting Pauline introductory formula establishes connection with 6:2 and likewise argues from an assumption. Various connecting points between 7:1ff and Chapter 6 have been suggested:  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in 6:23 recalling the principle of 6:14b;<sup>1</sup> the formula  $\epsilon\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in 6:23 with its idea of union with Christ in death and in life;<sup>2</sup>  $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in 7:1 recalling the  $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  of 6:23 (cf. 6:9, 14). A change of rule from law to grace is thus the burden of 7:1-6 corresponding to the change from sin to grace within Chapter 6. O. Michel sets out the parallelism in thought and vocabulary between Chapters 6 and 7.<sup>3</sup>

The relation of 7:4 to Chapter 6 is strikingly close. O. Kuss<sup>4</sup> comments, "In dem v4 wird das Kap. 6 rekapituliert: der Finalsatz v4c nimmt 6, 12-13 wieder auf, wdhrend v4a.b die Taufaussagen 6,1-11 zusammenfasst". C.H. Dodd also recognises the connection, v4 "bears

1. J.B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p.300.

2. M.-J. Lagrange, "Épître aux Romains", 1950, p.160.

3. "Der Brief an die Römer", 1963, p.166. The connection between Chapters 6 and 7 is so close the one can be used to clarify the other. cf. A. Nygren's arrangement of the "thoroughgoing parallelism" between the two, op. cit., pp.268ff; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.177 and nl; U.Luz, op. cit., 170f.

4. "Der Römerbrief", 1963, 2, p.437.

the weight of the argument. It is essentially a re-statement of the position maintained in vi:1-11. The Christian is dead in union with his crucified Lord".<sup>1</sup> The acrist passive (ἐθανάτωθητε) is best understood by reference to 6:3 rather than by allegorising the marriage figure.<sup>2</sup> The phrase ἵνα κατισχύσῃμεν τῷ θεῷ in 7:4 should not be

1. op. cit., p.101.

2. We reject the view that the marriage figure is an allegory, (so E.H. Gifford, op. cit., pp.134ff, followed by W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam). W.G. Kümmel ("Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus", 1929, pp.39ff; cf. J. Murray, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1967, Part 1, pp.240ff) argues convincingly against the allegorical interpretation. Gifford's view that it is a psychological allegory in which the same person appears throughout but in different moral stages each defined by relation to Christ, is of interest. Any allegorical interpretation however tends to become an exercise in ingenuity. Nor do we follow C.H. Dodd's too harsh judgment (op. cit., p.103; see rather J.B. Lightfoot, op. cit., pp.300ff and his useful notes on other images of Paul doubly applied, *ibid.* pp.24f, 73, on 1 Thess 2:7 and 5:4; also E.F. Scott, "Paul's Epistle to the Romans", 1955, pp.46ff; J. Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", *E.G.T.*, 2, p.637; C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.136; T.W. Manson, "Peake 1962", p.945, para. 822a) that Paul is unable to handle a sustained metaphor which implies that we must simply salvage what we can. We regard the marriage figure as a little parable or metaphor. We must distinguish the main point of the illustration only, and not attempt to relate all the details to the application. There is in fact no completely adequate analogy for what happened in Christ in the field of marriage relations or for that matter in any other field of human experience. The key thought here for Paul's purpose is that of change effected by death. "All Paul needs for his purpose is a death ..." (C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.136; cf. M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.162; O. Kuss, op. cit., p.436). The point of the illustration is the effect of the husband's death on the legal status of the wife. So 7:1 states the general principle that death cancels obligations. This is illustrated in 7:2 by the specific example from marriage law as it relates to the husband. v3 continues the illustration more concretely and extends the thought with its suggestion of the possibility of another relationship. v4 builds on this and applies the figure to the spiritual position of Christians, resuming the ἀδελφοί of v1, almost as if the illustration can be regarded as an interruption between principle and application. Chapter 8 develops the thought. We understand the marriage figure to end with v3. J.D.M. Derrett, "Law in the New Testament", 1970, pp.461ff, claims that Paul inserts a reference in 7:1-4 to the institution of levirate marriage. The fruit of union with Christ then becomes the progeny of the Law.

interpreted as referring to children <sup>1.</sup> by an extension of the marriage figure but as the moral outcome of the Christian life.<sup>2.</sup> We have in fact returned to the ethical question of Chapter 6 or perhaps we should say that we have never left the ethical question, so closely intertwined are the Gospel indicative and the Gospel imperative. The key words of 7:4 (ἐθανάτωσθε , σωματός , ἐτέρω , ἐνεργούντι , καρποφορήσωμεν ) should all be regarded in the light of Chapter 6.<sup>3.</sup>

1. As eg. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.137; cf. E. Best, "The Letter of Paul to the Romans", 1967, p.78.

2. So J.B. Lightfoot, E.H. Gifford, J. Denney, B.F. Westcott, W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, C.H. Dodd, F.F. Bruce, M.-J. Lagrange, T.W. Manson, W.G. Kümmel, Arndt-Gingrich, p.406.

3. In 7:4 σὺν τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to the slain, crucified Body of Christ (so J. Calvin, E.H. Gifford, J.B. Lightfoot, J. Denney, W. Sanday, and A.C. Headlam, H. Lietzmann, A.E. Garvie, H. Moule, A. Schlatter, J. Moffat, M.-J. Lagrange, A. Nygren, J. Murray, O. Michel, O. Kuss, H. Conzelmann, R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament, 1, p.147, A.van Dülmen, op. cit., p.104 n103, T.W. Manson, "Peake 1962", p.945, para. 822a, Arndt-Gingrich p.807). It should not be taken as referring to the mystical body which is the Church (so A. Schweitzer, "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle", 1931, pp.118, 188; C.H. Dodd, F.J. Leenhardt, A.M. Hunter, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1955, p.70 "probably", J. Knox, "The Interpreter's Bible", 9, 1954, pp.487f "probably"). C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.136, sees a reference to both with the stress on the former. It is not necessary however at every mention of the σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ to make an extension to the Church as Christ's Body. Barrett's qualification seems to us to show some hesitancy, in apportioning the emphasis so much in favour of the crucified Body. The background of this phrase in 7:4 lies in 6:11, where the Christian is said to enter into the Death of Christ through baptism. Paul goes on there immediately to speak of the Resurrection. This suggests that the event in its unity - the Death/Resurrection of Christ - is in mind. In any case it is simply not true for the Christian to say, "I am dead to the law etc. through the Church". The Church itself is a result, rather than a cause. We should therefore restrict the meaning of σὺν here to the crucified Body of Christ.

In 7:5 Θάνατος should be understood in the light of 6:21 (cf. 6:23). We can regard it in v5 as a personification - death is the tyrant who rules mankind. The concept of obedient service has already appeared in Chapter 6 with its figure of the two masters. 7:6 defines the new life as obedience over against the other obedience of the old life. This term drawn from slavery is not an altogether happy one.<sup>1.</sup> It requires qualification but the argument has run in this direction. The new relationship is one of obedience interpreted as freedom. It is also one of freedom interpreted as obedience. The Christian is free from sin (Chapter 6 in particular although sin is also much involved in Chapter 7) and free from law (Chapter 7 in particular although law also appears in 6:14f). But the freedom is not licence, on the contrary the obedience of faith is defined in terms of the object of faith which is Christ. Therefore the objection<sup>2.</sup> which is considered in Chapter 6, that sin is strengthened when freedom from law is advocated, is shown to be false.

---

1. cf. D. Daube, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism", 1956, pp.283ff.

2. A. Schlatter, "Gottes Gerechtigkeit", 1959, p.227, says with Freudian insight, "Das ist die Antwort an die, die von der Befreiung vom Gesetz die Ermächtigung zur Sünde erwarten, sei es, dass sie diese fürchten, sei es, dass sie sie begehren".

2. 7:1-6 and 7:7-25.

The section 7:1-6 is also forward looking. M.-J. Lagrange<sup>1.</sup> expresses well the movement of thought within the verses: "Ces deux versets<sup>2.</sup> sont comme un point culminant d'où l'on peut voir la région que l'on vient de quitter et celle où l'on entre, la sujétion à la Loi et la liberté de l'Esprit". In v5 we have a cluster of key terms for the study of 7:7-25. In the words of O. Michel,<sup>3.</sup> "In v5 finden wir alle Begriffe vor, die für den folgenden Abschnitt Rom 7, 7-25 notwendig sind; man kann geradezu in v5-6 eine thematische Vorausnahme der beiden folgenden Abschnitte Rom 7,7-25 und 8,1-11 sehen". The terms of the important complex comprising flesh, sin, law and death all appear within v5. Together they are the old aeon,<sup>4.</sup> the way of death,<sup>5.</sup> or in the language of 5:12ff "Adam's Age". The terms of this complex will be presented to us again in 7:7-25, each in itself and also in their inter-relations, but in a different construction.

1. op. cit., p.163.

2. i.e. vv5f.

3. op. cit., p.167. cf. U. Luz, op. cit., pp.166, 171, 177.

4. A. Nygren works constantly with the two aeons.

5. cf. O. Michel, op. cit., p.167.



The phrase τὰ δὲ τοῦ νόμου which qualifies τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν anticipates 7:7ff. "Here St. Paul, as his manner is, 'throws up a finger post' which points to the coming section of his argument".<sup>1.</sup> The thought will be taken up and developed in 7:7ff in which the crucial relation of sin and law will be dealt with. The hint given in v5 goes beyond anything yet said about the law. The precise connection between sin and law is analysed in 7:7ff by means of an objection expressed in order to be refuted. It is in fact not too much to say that the entire section 7:7-25 is a commentary on this phrase. "So ist denn auch ganz deutlich in 7,5 das Thema von 7,(7)14-25 formuliert....".<sup>2.</sup>

### 3. 7:1-6 and 8:1ff.

In the mainstream of the argument of Romans we are to regard 7:7-25 as a long digression.<sup>3.</sup> The fact that we can read with good sense straight on from 7:6 to 8:1 is evidence of this digression or interlude or interpolation or intermediate passage as it is variously described. The digression is made necessary by certain earlier comments by Paul concerning the law, eg. 3:20, 31; 4:15; 5:13, 20; 6:14; 7:1-6. F.J. Leenhardt calls them, "quick indications which it was necessary to

1. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.174.

2. R. Bultmann, "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", Exegetica, 1967, p.205.

3. So W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.11; R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.204; A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.112; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.140; P. Althaus, "Paulus und Luther über <sup>den</sup> Menschen", 1963, p.129; E. Ellwein, "Das Rätsel von Römer VII", Kerugma und Dogma, 1, (1955) 261; G. Bornkamm, "Early Christian Experience", 1969, p.88; K. Kertelge, "Exegetische Überlegungen zum Verständnis der paulinischen Anthropologie nach Römer 7", Z.N.W., 62, (1971) 112.

resume and amplify".<sup>1</sup> This becomes an urgent purpose with 7:5-6 in particular because of the connection affirmed between law and sin in v5 and because of the strong assertion in v6 κατηρηθήσεται τὸ νόμον. "One cannot keep in mind clearly enough the fact that the thesis of 7:1-6 ('freed from the law') expresses something unheard of".<sup>2</sup> In 8:1 the particle οὐκ is used rather than the adversative δέ and indicates an inference. The immediate connection is with 7:25a<sup>3</sup> in that the content of these two verses belongs to the positive pole of the grand antithesis in which 7:7ff and 8:1ff stand. The more distant connection is with 7:6. The positive content of 7:6, of which a hint has already been given in the other possible relationship of the wife in the marriage figure and which is developed in v4 in terms of belonging to the Risen Christ and bearing fruit for God, is resumed and amplified in 8:1ff. 7:7-25 has already expanded the negative content of 7:5. The double antithesis in v6b sums up the positive over against the negative.

---

1. op. cit., p.185.

2. G. Bornhamm, op. cit., p.88.

3. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.69f, denies that 8:1 is an inference from 7:25a which he thinks too brief and indefinite. He sees 6:1-7:6 as the premiss. He appeals to 2:1 and 5:12 where Paul uses an inferential particle in order to connect a new thought without linking it with what immediately precedes.

We must now define the relationship between 7:7-25 and Chapter 8. 7:7-25 is the negative pole in a pair of polar opposites in which Chapter 8 is the positive. The difference between 7:7-25 and Chapter 8 is the difference between before and after, lost and found, defeat and victory, the old and the new, or in the ultimate categories it is the difference between death and life.

The antithesis in which Chapter 8 as a whole stands in relation to 7:7-25 is clearly seen in the section 8:1-4 which is related antithetically to 7:7-25. Not only is the little section in its entirety constituted by the grand antithesis but the antithesis is either implied or expressed in each of its four verses. Thus in v1 "no condemnation" implies condemnation; in v2 we have the two opposed "laws" or principles; in v3 God does what the law could not do; in v4 we have κατὰ ἔσπευα contrasted with κατὰ πνεύμα.

What is said in Chapter 8 is impressive in its own right but it is all the more so in contrast to the gloomy message of 7:7ff. J. Kürzinger<sup>1</sup> says of 7:7ff, "Er zeichnet dieses Bild in scharfen Strichen, um ihm gegenüber das Heilsbewusstsein zu wecken und die Hoffnung zu stärken für die in Christus Jesus «aus dem Tod zum Leben» Gerufenen (6,13)". This contrast is evident in various directions.

---

1. "Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis von Röm 7", Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge 7-8 (1963-4), 274. cf. W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.147: "With Chapter viii we pass out again into the sunshine of the life of grace".

1. The εὑω -form appears many times in 7:7ff but never in Chapter 8. The emphasis in 8:1-4, as in the whole Chapter, is on the action of which God is the subject. When the εὑω of 7:7ff reappears in 8:2 in the accusative of the second person singular,<sup>1</sup> it is as the one to whom something radical has happened by act of God. The piled-up terms of 8:2 throw the emphasis heavily on God, whereas in 7:7ff the emphasis, (but we shall qualify this statement later in the study), is on the recurring εὑω culminating in the αὐτός εὑω of v25b.

1. Four variants are found. The omission of the pronoun may be disregarded (although see C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.153 nl) as poorly attested and inadequate. ημεῖς may be taken as a correction of με, perhaps under the influence of v4. The early variant με shows that the difficulty is a long-standing one and may be regarded as a substitute for εἰ which was felt to be disruptive and as an accommodation to the first person singular of 7:7ff. We prefer εἰ, which is a very early reading in advance of the Western text. It is found in ℛ, B and some koine MSS. εἰ is the lectio difficilior and therefore the least likely to have been inserted, coming as it does so soon after the plural τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This conclusion may be regarded as highly probable though not certain. The exegetical sense is not affected in the choice between εἰ and με. For the text see the Bible Societies' Text 1966; H. Lietzmann, op. cit., pp.78f; E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, p.361 nl54. εἰ is adopted by W.G. Kümmel; F.J. Leenhardt, O. Michel, O. Kuss, F. Blass and A. Debrunner and R.W. Funk, "A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature", 1961, para.281 - hereafter designated "Blass-Debrunner-Funk"; A. van Dülmen, op. cit., p.120 nl50; E. Gaugler, "Der Brief an die Römer", 1945, 1, p.258; M.-J. Lagrange, C.H. Dodd; B. Weiss, "Die Paulinischen Briefe im Berichtigten Text", 1896, p.73. N.E.B. reads "you" (εἰ). με is adopted by W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam; H. Lietzmann; H. Von Soden; R.S.V.; and by the Bible Societies' Text 1966 with a "C" rating.

2. The Spirit appears many times in Chapter 8 but never in 7:7ff. The indwelling Spirit of Chapter 8 is set against the sin indwelling the flesh otherwise known as the εγω of 7:7ff.

3. The name "Jesus Christ" is absent in 7:7-24, 25b. The occurrence in v25a anticipates Chapter 8:1ff.

4. The ὅτι of 8:1 in the relation between 7:7ff and 8:1ff, corresponds to the ὅτι ὅτι of 7:6 in the antithesis between 7:5 and 7:6. (cf. 3:21 where ὅτι also indicates contrast with the preceding.)

5. The "no condemnation" of 8:1 answers the situation described in 7:7ff. G. Bornkamm<sup>1</sup> sees the assertion as the climax to which the passage 7:7ff is building.

6. The phrase τοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 8:1 stands over against the ἐγὼ of 7:25b. G. Bornkamm<sup>2</sup> comments, "The 'in Christ Jesus' puts an end to the 'I of myself' (7.25)". C.L. Mitton<sup>3</sup> makes the interpretation of 7:7-25 turn on the antithesis between the two terms. We agree that the antithesis is important but an understanding of the passage must be more broadly based. There is in fact no single "key" within the detailed exegesis of the passage by which the problems of 7:7-25 can be unlocked. The antithesis should be borne in mind in translating 7:25. The N.E.B. rendering, "God alone,.....", although a paraphrase rather than a strict translation reflects the train of thought accurately. The antithesis is, "God alone" opposed to "I alone", that is, "I apart from God".

1. op. cit., p.100.

2. ibid. p.100.

3. "Romans vii Reconsidered", Expository Times, 65 (1953-4), 78-81; 99-103; 132-135. He is followed by R.N. Longenecker, "Paul Apostle of Liberty", 1964, pp.112ff.

7. ἡλευθέρωσέν in 8:2 gives a clear indication of before and after in terms of bondage and freedom.

8. The comprehensive category θάνατος as presented in 7:7ff is answered by the comprehensive category ζωή ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as presented in Chapter 8.

We must interpret 7:7ff in the light of the controlling antithesis between 7:7ff and 8:1ff.<sup>1</sup> R.N. Longenecker<sup>2</sup> asserts that the contrast between 7:7ff and 8:1ff corresponds to the two conditions of man in 5:12-20, "in Adam" and "in Christ". Indeed we may say that the antithesis between 7:7ff and 8:1ff reflects the broader antithesis between the bad news of 1:18-3:20 and the good news of 3:21-8:39. We can go even further and claim that it provides us with one outstanding instance of Paul's characteristic mode of thought which is essentially antithetical.

---

1. U. Luz, op. cit., pp.171f, asserts that behind Chapters 7 and 8 there lies the traditional confrontation of old and new existence which he identifies as one of the traditional structures in the thought forms of Paul.

2. op. cit., p.93.





THE EPISTOLARY CONTEXT OF 7:7-25.CHAPTER 4.

We must not read 7:7-25 as if it stood in isolation. It is certainly a digression and it has a clearly defined unity of its own, but is also intimately related to other parts of the Epistle. It is significant that W.G. Kummel, R. Bultmann, G. Bornkamm and H. Braun, in their important essays on 7:7-25, all locate the passage within the movement of thought in the Epistle as a whole, at or near the beginning of their treatises.

The passage on which our interest centres belongs to a framework which consists of four passages: 1:18-3:20; 5:12-21; 7:7-25; Chapters 9-11. We shall now consider the relation of our section to these other parts of the Epistle.

In the furthest distance we have 1:18-3:20<sup>1</sup> in which the situation prior to the salvation history is set out. Paul's order of approach<sup>2</sup> requires us to confront the message of gloom which culminates in the announcement that all mankind is condemned before the righteous God, before we hear the good news. Thus the essential presuppositions

1. P.S. Minear, op. cit., p.67, recognises the similarities between the argument of Chapter 7 and that of 1:18-3:20. cf. C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.100 (against A. Nygren).

2. Strictly speaking the good news is already contained in 1:1-17, but if we regard 1:1-17 as preface and take the main body of the Epistle to be 1:18-15:33 then it is true to say that in the main part the order of treatment is - first the bad then the good.

are stated in the light of which alone the words and acts of God in his saving purpose may be fully understood. It should be noted that in the first section of this passage, 1:18-32, the account of man's wickedness is expressed in terms of the Genesis narrative of Adam's fall.<sup>1.</sup>

In the nearer distance we have 5:12-21.<sup>2.</sup> Here we find that outlook which understands history by splitting it into two parts.<sup>3.</sup>

In each part there is a leading man who represents<sup>4.</sup> all who are within his sphere, in the one case Adam, in the other Christ.<sup>5.</sup> These two

1. Cf. M.D. Hooker, *N.T.S.*, 6 (1960), 297-306, who analyses 1:18-32 against a Genesis background.

2. P. Benoit, *op. cit.*, pp.486f, recognises clearly the connection between 5:12ff and 7:7ff. He claims that 7:7ff is based on exactly the same general plan of salvation as 5:12-14 and that these two texts are to be explained in strict connection. R. Bultmann, "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", *Exegetica*, 1967, p.209 (hereafter designated - R. Bultmann, "Römer 7...."), makes a passing reference to the unity of 7:7ff with 5:12-21, but he is at the end of the article and does not develop the observation. F.J. Leenhardt, *op. cit.*, p.148 n3, sets out the parallelism between paragraphs within 5:12-21 and Chapters 6-8. cf. S. Lyonnet, "L'Histoire Du Salut Selon Le Chapitre VII De L'Épître Aux Romains", *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 117, 148ff.

3. cf. W. Wrede, *op. cit.*, pp.81f; A. Nygren, *op. cit.*, pp.206ff, 21f; F.F. Bruce, *op. cit.*, pp.125ff.

4. cf. H.W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality", *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, 1936, pp.49-62; also R.P. Shedd, "Man in Community", 1958. We shall return to this theme.

5. R. Bultmann, "Paul", *Existence and Faith*, 1961, pp.127, 134, maintains that Paul is drawing on Gnostic mythology. A.M. Hunter, "Paul and his Predecessors", 1961, pp.40, 43, 140, asserts that Paul's concept of Christ as Second Adam goes back to the pre-Pauline Christian tradition. C.K. Barrett, "From First Adam to Last", 1962, p.23, maintains that Paul prefers to work from first principles and allow the event to supply its own categories rather than borrow readymade forms. O. Cullmann, "Christology of the New Testament", 1959, pp.170ff, 191, argues that in 5:12ff Paul united the two basic concepts "Son of Man" and "Servant of God", exactly as Jesus united them but independently of the theology of the early Church. In his view the idea of the Second Adam goes back to the same root as that of the Son of Man concept. Cullmann sets out the difference between the Heavenly Man doctrine of Gnosticism and the Christian doctrine of incarnation and atonement and brings out well the difference between the representative roles of Adam and of Christ. (pp.173, 191.)

figures stand for the two great opposites or aeons or human conditions in the history of mankind. They are related as type and anti-type. The action of these representatives, together with the consequences which flow from that action, holds good for all who belong to their sphere. The logic of this connection between the one and ~~and~~ the mass is not articulated here,<sup>1.</sup> instead Paul gives a detailed comparison and contrast between disobedient Adam and obedient Christ. The latter not only reverses but more than counter-balances the work of the former, so that those who belong to Christ's sphere or aeon gain more than was lost on account of Adam's act.

Chapters 9-11 comprise a long and closely argued passage, heavily buttressed with scripture references, the relation of which to the Epistle as a whole has provoked much discussion. We can establish three main lines of connection by which we may understand these Chapters for our present purpose.<sup>2.</sup>

1. The first connects with a problem which was fundamental both to Paul and to the primitive Church. The anguish<sup>3.</sup> and vehemence of 9:1ff

1. E.H. Gifford, op. cit., p.115, following Chrysostom, says that Paul constantly repeats "the one" in order that when the Jew asks "how by the well-doing of one, Christ, was the world saved?" Paul may be able to say in reply, "how by the disobedience of one, Adam, was the world condemned?" The key to the logic here is the concept of the unity of mankind and the solidarity of the group. cf. R.P. Shedd, op. cit., p.97: "The unity of all mankind is a presupposition transferred without challenge from Judaism and the Old Testament into the theology of the Epistles of Paul".

2. J. Munck analyses the internal structure of Chapters 9-11 thus: 9:1-29, the problem; 9:30-10:21, the solution; Chapter 11, the detailed practical application of the solution, resuming 9:29.

3. cf. B. Noack, "Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans", Studia Theologica, 19-20 (1965-66), 165f. There is also a wider reference, in that here as elsewhere Paul's missionary experience shows through.

and the determined effort to think the issue through to a conclusion are evidence of Paul's personal involvement. We agree with J. Munck when he says "An earlier debate concerning Romans 9-11, which maintained that this whole section was an excursus, or a previously composed passage inserted after chapter 8 and before chapter 12, can now be considered resolved for good. The assured result emerging from this discussion is that these three chapters deal with a problem fundamental to the earliest church, which if not correctly resolved will leave the whole import of the letter hanging in mid-air".<sup>1</sup> The problem is the unbelief and obduracy of Israel and the inference this requires concerning God's promise. If God has abandoned his people and gone back on his word the consequences are very serious indeed. The point at issue then in these Chapters is God's plan and his will-to-save.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. "Christ and Israel", 1967, pp.33f. cf. A. Nygren, op. cit., pp.353ff. A.D. Nock, "St. Paul", 1938, p.217, calls Chapters 9-11 a digression. On Paul's method of constructing 9-11, cf. C.H. Dodd, "According to the Scriptures", 1952, p.18.

2. A. Nygren, op. cit., pp.354ff, 365ff, insists that there is no theodicy here as this is an anthropocentric concept alien to Paul which errs in calling God to account before human reason. He accepts and expresses very helpfully a concept of predestination because it is theocentric and establishes God's freedom and mercy behind which we cannot go. We think however that there is an element of theodicy in 9-11, in as much as the issue raised lies within Paul's doctrine of God. We suspect that Nygren's denial involves some confusion in the definition of terms. cf. F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.183; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), op. cit., p.64. E. Kuhl, "Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer", 1913, heads Chapters 9-11, "Die Paulinischen Theodizee".

2. The second connecting line leads us to the situation within the Church at Rome. F.F. Bruce writes, "He takes up the subject too, we may infer, because the situation in the Roman Church required it".<sup>1</sup> This holds good whether we regard that Church as having a Jewish Christian predominance or not, or whether as we have argued, we understand a variety of Christian assemblies or theological emphases.<sup>2</sup>

3. The third concerns the integral position of Chapters 9-11 in the Epistle. There is no question that the main argument is finished<sup>3</sup> with the conclusion of Chapter 8 and thereafter only some tidying up remains to be done. The Chapters are an essential part of the Epistle. This can be grasped in several ways. a) The people of Israel has never been out of sight for long prior to Chapter 9. b) An immediate connection can be made<sup>4</sup> with the preceding lyrical passage 8:31-39, which anticipates

1. op. cit., p.182.

2. H.L. Ellison, "The Mystery of Israel", 1968, p.85, says that Paul is turning from one group in the Roman Church to another throughout the Epistle. Likewise P.S. Minear, op. cit., p.73, suggests that 9-11 reflect charges against Paul from unconverted leaders in synagogues at Rome.

3. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.225.

4. cf. U. Luz, op. cit., p.169.

a full salvation. But how then can Israel's rejection be accounted for and how can we envisage the possibility of Israel's salvation? So the question, "what can separate us...", leads into a consideration of the people who seem to have separated themselves.<sup>1.</sup> c) We may also appeal to the resumption in 9:11 of the justification vocabulary of Chapters 1-8.<sup>2.</sup> d) We may compare the way in which Paul approaches the problem

1. F.F. Bruce deals with Chapters 1-11 as a unit, as does U. Luz. H.L. Ellison, op. cit., p.27, points out that the doxology comes at the end of Chapter 11 and not Chapter 8, an indication, he suggests, that the climax comes at the end of 11.

2. B. Noack, op. cit., p.158. Noack argues for the integral connection of 9-11 with the Epistle as a whole. He indicates what he regards as the structure of the Epistle by an outer frame comprising 1:9-13 and 15:23-29, 33, and an inner frame comprising 1:14-16, 17 and 9:13-36. He also distinguishes one group of material (1:1-17; 3:9-20, 27-31; 4:9-11) which he calls the "current" of Romans and another (Chapters 5-8) which he calls the "backwater". He regards 9-11 as a composition of the moment during the dictation of which the solution to the problem, - can Israel be saved and how? - flashed on Paul by revelation. We agree with the insistence on the essential connection of 9-11 with the whole, but not with his method of connecting it and we reject his "instant theology" theory of the genesis of Paul's solution. (see rather J. Weiss, op. cit., I, pp.407f; J. Munok, "Christ and Israel", 1967, p.28). At best we have no means of knowing that it happened like that. This part, like the whole, was the product of previous deliberation. We repeat our phrase "creative synthesis". Noack's statement (p.165) that "it is completely inconceivable that Paul should have known right from the beginning, that is from 1X.1...." is a purely gratuitous assumption. On the contrary it is quite conceivable. Also - his treatment of 1.Thess. 2 is superficial; 9-11 does not in fact become a "sham fight" on a different interpretation; there is no evidence for his claim that Paul writes because Christians at Rome have ridiculed him for not preaching there; and we find his use of the formula Του Σαῦω τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνων obscure.



of the law in this Epistle with the way in which he approaches the problem of Israel. We find that a certain parallelism is evident. Hints regarding the law<sup>1.</sup> are found before the study in depth in Chapter 7. Similar hints regarding Israel<sup>2.</sup> are found before the major discussion in Chapters 9-11. Again, in dealing with the law Paul appears to contradict himself - the law is abolished, Christ is the end of the law; the law is established, Christ fulfil/s the law. A similar equivocal tone seems to appear with regard to Israel - Israel has an advantage, Israel has no advantage; Israel has been rejected, Israel has not been rejected.

When we so understand Chapters 9-11 the emphases in the passage stand out more clearly. Paul is dealing with peoples and parts of peoples<sup>3.</sup> and so here as elsewhere there is a representative significance with no theologising about the destiny of individuals. He is concerned with God's plan for mankind comprehended in its great division of Jew and Gentile. He reduces the issue finally to an assertion about the mercy and freedom of God on which alone God's election rests without reference to character or

1. of. U. Luz, op. cit., pp.167ff. He identifies the resumption of themes merely hinted at as one of the thought structures characteristic of Paul.

2. eg. 1:16; 2:9f; but in particular 3:1-9.

3. J. Munck, "Christ and Israel", 1967, p.70.

works.<sup>1.</sup> He works with the Old Testament concept of the remnant.<sup>2.</sup> He claims possession of a "mystery" which signifies knowledge obtained by revelation from God. He dares to explain the tragic negative (Israel's "No" to the Gospel) by an underlying positive and so the hardening of Israel is ultimately God's doing, with its origin in a gracious purpose which is for the benefit of all. The negative thus understood serves the interest of an all-embracing positive. God's salvation has been rejected by some for the present, in order that it may be accepted by all in the end. And so to the concluding doxology, finely expressed by the N.E.B., "Source, Guide and Goal of all that is...". Once more a pattern of thought appears with which we have become familiar earlier. The triumphant conclusion in 11:33-36 matches the anticipatory exclamation in 7:25a, where the resolution of that particular problem is located in God, outside the closed circle of the drama. It corresponds also to the "much more" by which the superiority of Adam is emphasised and lastly to the silence which descends when the final conclusion of 1:18-3:20 has been pronounced that all are guilty under wrath and judgement and before the positive

---

1. of. A. Nygren, *op. cit.*, p.369.

2. of. H.L. Ellison, *op. cit.*, pp.78ff; J. Munck, *op. cit.*, pp.108ff; A. Nygren, *op. cit.*, pp.392ff; G. Schrenk, *T.D.N.T.*, 4, pp.209ff.

movement in the grand antithesis gets under way and the word of grace is heard. In similar fashion, in the doxology of Chapter 11, the resolution of the problem of Israel's rejection is found outside Israel, in the God who constituted the people in the first place and used Pharoah as well as Moses and will use that very rejection as a means towards the salvation of the whole world.<sup>1.</sup>

We can see now how close the connection is between 7:7ff and Chapters 9-11. The two passages deal with the same fundamental problem but in different terms. In 7:7ff Paul considers the problem of the law, that institution which was Israel's peculiar treasure and glory. He reflects on how the law must be understood in the light of faith in Jesus Christ. In Chapters 9-11 Paul considers the problem of Israel, that so special people, and strives to understand how the elect people must be understood in view of their rejection of Jesus Christ and moreover in a manner which does full justice to the God whose gifts and calling are irrevocable. Paul is therefore concerned in both passages with the relation between the old and the new. His aim is to establish the unity of God's dealings with man.<sup>2.</sup> He does this by adopting a theocentric argument in each case, in which he moves out of the closed circle of the argument to the God who stands transcendent and sovereign. We can also express the matter in Christological terms.

1. cf. the use of ἀνκεφαλαιώδους in Eph. 1:10 and see H.L. Ellison, op. cit., pp.97ff, on "Israel in the Epistle to the Ephesians".

2. We think it possible to regard Romans as an attempt to unify the old and the new by a fresh, that is a Christian, understanding of God and to structure the Epistle accordingly.

In the one case we have to assert a displacement of the law by Christ, the perfect law-keeper, the fulfiller of the law in judgement and in love, himself the new Torah. In the other case we must assert the vicarious nature of Jesus Christ who represents the people of Israel and carries them forward into God's future for them.

The connecting link between 1:18-3:20; 5:12-21; 7:7-25 and Chapters 9-11, each in its own way so different from the rest, is the salvation history mode of thought.<sup>1</sup> In each of these passages Paul is

---

1. E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.357ff, insists that Romans deals first and last with "the progress of salvation history". He analyses the passage in this light (cf. his "Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments", 1948, p.253 n239). He understands this as a further development of the sketch of salvation history in Gal. 2:15ff. (On the παύσαυτος, the guardian or custodian, of Gal. 3:24ff, cf. K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Consciousness of the West", H.T.R., 56, (1963), 206ff). R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.279, says that 7:7-25 discusses the significance of the law in the history of salvation. (cf. his "Christ the End of the Law", Essays: Philosophical and Theological, 1955, p.46.) Also cf. W. Wrede, op. cit., pp.114f; C.K. Barrett, "From First Adam to Last", 1962, p.62: The law "could not do what it professed to do, because its setting was wrong. It belonged to this age.....". S. Lyonnet, "Tu ne convoiteras pas (Rom vii, 7)", Neotestamentica et Patristica, Freundesgabe Oscar Cullmann, 1962, ed. W.C. van Unnik, pp.163ff, sums up his attempt to relate 7:7 to the Paradise narrative in Genesis by saying that Paul is thinking salvation history-wise. K. Stendahl, op. cit., understands the Pauline theology in general and Romans 7 in particular within the framework of "sacred history". cf. also S. Lyonnet, "L'Histoire Du Salut Selon le Chapitre vii de l'Épître aux Romains", Biblica, 43 (1962), 122f, 147ff; J. Blank, "Der gespaltene Mensch", Bibel und Leben, 1968, p.15; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.5: "Paul sees history gathering at nodal points, and crystallising upon outstanding figures...."; J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.48. A.J. Bandstra, "Law and the Elements of the World", 1964, pp.137f, acknowledges the contribution of the salvation history view to the understanding of 7:7ff but thinks that "it does not seem to give a satisfactory account of the intense personal struggle portrayed in vv14-25". We will claim to account adequately for these verses in terms of a dramatisation. Also cf. O. Cullmann, "Salvation in History", 1967, pp.129f, on the connection between 5:12ff, and Chapter 7, and Chapters 9-11 as salvation history.

considering the saving purpose of God in history. In the first, 1:18-3:20, he does so by way of laying down presuppositions which are necessary for understanding God's saving deeds in history. In the second, 5:12-21, he makes comparison and contrast on a cosmic scale as a means of understanding what has happened through Jesus Christ. In the last passage, Chapters 9-11, he adopts a sustained exegetical procedure which is illumined by revelation. In the third passage, 7:7ff, he analyses the place occupied by the law in the saving purpose of God. It is worked out there in its own special way, not as in the explicitly Christological analogy of 5:12-21, and not in the tight, Old Testament based dialectic of Chapters 9-11, but in a form which we shall seek to establish as sui generis. This literary form, which seeks to understand by constructing a dramatisation, lends itself admirably to a salvation history theme. History as the Bible is mainly interested in it, which means prophetic or salvation history, is the stage on which the events of the Eternal's salvation are performed. 7:7-25 is a drama<sup>1</sup> in which the chosen characters - law, sin, death, the "I" - play their allotted parts with a view to elucidating the function of the law in God's saving purpose. It is precisely this salvation history interest which enables Paul to transcend his personal experience yet without losing touch with it.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. P. Benoit, *op. cit.*, sees the "I" of 7:7ff as the stage within which the drama unfolds. This leads to some confusion in his thought. We regard the "I" as one character on the stage. It is too pedantic to ask, "what stage?" But if the question is pressed, it is sufficient to say that the dramatisation is what matters. The "stage" is in the mind of the writer and the reader.

2. We must beware of abstracting 7:15-20 from their context and regarding them as the locus classicus of an existentialist or psychological interpretation. These verses are in fact subordinate to the salvation history interest of the whole passage and are located within the controlling dramatic presentation.

1. The History of Interpretation of the εἷς in 7:7-25.

This constitutes a large subject in itself in view of the very many contributions which have been made to the study of the passage. In addition to the sheer weight of material certain considerations add to the difficulty of the subject. The view of some writers tends to be complex and to combine different elements and so there are few pure types but many hybrids, variously derived. The sections vv7-13 and vv14-25 are sometimes dealt with on different presuppositions by the same writer. The view which considers that the reference is to mankind in general may or may not introduce Adam or Adamic man. The textual problems at the end of the Chapter are handled in different ways by commentators and this affects the interpretation. The difficulty of precise classification may therefore be easily imagined. The views and influence of Augustine and of M. Luther are of particular importance and again these form subjects of study in themselves. Augustine in his second interpretation<sup>1</sup> had a dominating effect on interpretation in the Middle Ages. Luther on the other hand set the scene for a long time thereafter.<sup>2</sup>

1. See W.G. Kümmel, "Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus", 1929, pp.90-94 for the earlier and the later views of Augustine and the reason for the change; also A.F.W. Lekkerkerker, "Römer 7 und Römer 9 bei Augustin", 1942.

2. In Luther's interpretation note his polemical involvement with Lyra; his close dependence on Augustine modified and deepened however by his intensely personal experience; his emphasis on the unity of the εἷς which is portrayed; his "Twelve Words" ("Luther: Lectures on Romans", translated and edited W. Pauck, 1961, pp.201ff) which, he claims, support a Christian reference. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.94f on Luther and especially P. Althaus, "Paulus und Luther über <sup>den</sup> Menschen", 1963. See also A.S. Wood, "The Theology of Luther's Lectures on Romans", S.J.T., 3, (1950), 1-18; 113-126; J.W. Heikinen, "Luther's Lectures on the Romans 1515-1516", Interpretation, 7 (April 1953) 178-194.



Our review must of necessity work with a large brush. We will sketch the broad sweep of the history and give a general classification. We will then indicate the conclusion reached by certain writers on the question which above all agitated the ancient Church and which has also exercised the Church of recent times. This question is whether the reference of 7:7-25 is to the Christian or to the non-Christian. We will finally consider some recent contributions of special significance to the understanding of the ΕΥΩ in 7:7-25.

The broad sweep of the history of interpretation may be outlined thus. Augustine provides the first turning-point. Prior to him<sup>1</sup> the ΕΥΩ was related to mankind in general, or to the Jews in general, as a rhetorical expression. Augustine made his famous change of mind on account of his controversy with Pelagius, although the degree to which this was a controlling factor is difficult to determine. In his second period he interpreted 7:7ff of Paul himself in his post-baptismal experience. This later view of Augustine's which reversed the earlier one dominated the Middle Ages. P. Abelard was an exception.<sup>2</sup> The reformers<sup>3</sup> Calvin, Luther, Melancthon and Beza followed the later Augustine although Bucer and Musculus did not.<sup>4</sup> Luther's influence was

1. cf. A.F.W. Lekkerkerker, op. cit., pp.5-14.

2. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.88.

3. See E. Ellwein, "Das Rätzel von Römer VII", Kerugma und Dogma, 1, (1955), 250ff for a convenient summary.

4. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.88.

the major one thereafter until Pietism revived the pre-Augustinian interpretation against the Augustine-Luther view. J.A. Bengel<sup>1</sup> in particular made an important contribution when he stressed the presentation of general truths in 7:7ff, while at the same time including Paul himself in the reference of the passage. In the nineteenth century the pre-Augustinian view became widespread. The Augustinian-Lutheran tradition however reappeared in J.C.K. von Hofman and T. Zahn and in certain Reformed writers such as H.F. Kohlbrugge and K. Barth. A. Nygren<sup>2</sup> gave the Augustinian-Lutheran view a new impetus in spite of the work of W.G. Kummel. In the post-Kummel period it would be true to say that the regnant school connects with the pre-Augustinian tradition, although the position is so complicated this statement requires qualification, as we shall see. The Augustine-Luther view is by no means abandoned.

The autobiographical interpretation of 7:7ff in which weight is placed on the personal reference of the passage to Paul himself has gained many supporters over the centuries.<sup>3</sup> We may take A. Nygren as an

1. Bengel's "Gnomon", a comprehensive commentary on Scripture, dates from 1742.

2. The Swedish original of his commentary is 1944, the E.T. is 1952.

3. Including the following: Ambrosius, Hilarius, Augustine (second period), Methodius, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, J.A. Bengel, J. Wesley, E.H. Gifford, J.C.K. von Hofman, T. Zahn, P. Wernle, W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, A.E. Garvie, H. Pretorius, T.R. Glover, E. de W. Burton, A. Whyte, A.S. Peake, A. Deissmann, C.A. Anderson Scott, W.L. Knox, E.F. Scott, K. Barth, E. Brunner, A.R. Vidler, M. Buber, C.L. Mitton, M. Goguel, C.H. Dodd, A. Nygren, H. Asmussen, J. Knox, C.F.D. Moule, W.D. Davies, A.J. Bandstra, J. Jeremias, W. Barclay, J. Murray, F.V. Filson, G.B. Caird, P.S. Minear, T.W. Manson, F.F. Bruce, E. Best, J.D.G. Dunn.

outstanding modern representative of this point of view, both on account of his clearly expressed view and his wide influence. Nygren emphasises that 7:7-25 belongs to the movement of thought in Chapters 5-8, which he regards as the second main division of the Epistle. As that section as a whole is about the Christian life, 7:7ff comprises the third affirmation therein of the Christian's freedom, this time in terms of the law. It is no parenthesis or interruption. He understands the use of the first person singular as "due to the fact that Paul here comes to an issue which, in the most proper sense, is the problem of his own life".<sup>1</sup> The law does for sin what the sun does for the seed. It represents God's "strange work" which precedes his "proper work". It provided Paul in his pre-Christian days with his cherished ideal in which he delighted. The Christian is free from the law in that he receives the righteousness of God in a wholly different way. The function of vv14-25 is thus to show that the law can never be a way of salvation, not even for the Christian. The Christian is not free from the law in the sense that he can set himself above the law. The law is impotent in the Christian on account of the carry-over from the old aeon which means on account of the εἰς. Nygren understands the change to the present tense in vv14ff as a sure sign that these verses refer to the Christian. He claims that a non-Christian reference violates Paul's thought elsewhere and that exegesis of 7:7ff is compatible with a Christian reference only. He interprets the tension portrayed in the εἰς between will and action in eschatological terms as "an expression

---

1. "Commentary on Romans", 1952, p.279.

of the Christian's status as participant in the new aeon even while, at the same time, he is also in the old".<sup>1</sup> There is then nothing of doubt or despair in the cry of 7:24 which is rather a factual recognition of the eschatological distress.

The rhetorical-general view of 7:7ff in which a generally valid fact is presented has also received notable support.<sup>2</sup> G. Bornkamm is a recent proponent of this view.<sup>3</sup> His essay is characterised by meticulous exegesis and a strong awareness of the importance of the whole context for the interpretation of particular verses. 7:7ff is about man under the law and sin, that is, unredeemed man, and Paul writes from the standpoint of faith. Bornkamm appeals for support to Gal. 5:17. The experiences of Romans 7 however cannot be left behind by the Christian but are present even for the Christian and indeed become wholly transparent only from the position of Christian faith. 7:7ff is essentially an apology for the law and an explanation of the fatal connection between law and sin understood as ἐνδύει which can express itself nomistically

1. *ibid.* p.293.

2. Including the following: Origen, Chrysostom; the Western Fathers "Ambrosiaster", the early Augustine, Pelagius, Julian, Hieronymus; Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Erasmus, H. Grotius, J.A. Bengel (in as far as he also stresses general truths), W. Wrede, J. Weiss, W. Bousset, A. Jülicher, M.-J. Lagrange, W.G. Kümmel, R. Bultmann, K.E. Kirk, M. Dibelius, P. Althaus, E. Fuchs, G. Bornkamm, J. Munck, R.N. Longenecker, F.J. Leenhardt, A.M. Hunter, C.K. Barrett, O. Kuss, J. Kürzinger, H. Braun, K.G. Kuhn, K. Stendahl, W. Manson, U. Luz, H. Anderson.

3. "Sin, Law and Death: An Exegetical Study of Romans 7", Early Christian Experience, 1969, pp.87ff. His debt to W.G. Kümmel and to R. Bultmann is obvious and is acknowledged.

as well as anti-nomistically, that is, by using the law to establish one's own righteousness. This "desire" slays the "I". The process is described "with almost mythological pictures by speaking of sin and the 'I' as two subjects",<sup>1</sup> thus indicating that a transcendent or trans-subjective event which is beyond the level of human decision and experience is in Paul's mind. This "I", which can have only a general meaning, exists therefore in illusion and death. Vv7-13 develops the history of the "I" from which it receives its essence in illusion and death. Vv14-25 develops the contradictory character of this existence in the split between the law and the "I", between willing and doing, and between sin and the self, the two sections being very closely connected.

A salvation history view of 7:7-25 is represented by a number of recent authors.<sup>2</sup> This regards 7:7ff in the light of the opening Chapters of Genesis and of Romans 5:12-21 and as a development of the outlook sketched in Galatians. It turns away from any preoccupation with psychological processes and individual experiences to a broader understanding of sin and redemption, and law and faith, within the dispensations

1. *ibid.* pp.90f.

2. Including the following: P. Blaser, A. Feuillet, A.F.W. Lekkerkerker, G. Schrenk, S. Lyonnet, P. Benoit, E. Stauffer, J. Blank, P.H. Menoud (Revelation and Tradition), *Interpretation*, 7 (1953), 133: "Paul is not alluding to a chapter in his own life, but to an epoch in the history of mankind". A very vigorous statement of this view is to be found in S. Lyonnet, "L'Histoire du Salut selon le Chapitre VII de l'Épître aux Romains", *Biblica*, 43 (1962) 117-151, see especially his conclusions pp.147ff.

constituted by the saving plan of God. "On a rabaisse à la description d'une crise subjective ce qu'il conçoit comme un drame cosmique."<sup>1</sup>

E. Käsemann has expressed this mode of thought clearly, "One is thinking in terms of salvation history when one divides world history into the epochs of Adam, Abraham, Moses and Christ and sees creation tending towards judgment via fall and redemption".<sup>2</sup>

When we come to the exegesis of 7:7-25 we will discuss in detail the relation of the ΕΥΩ to the Christian or the non-Christian. It is sufficient at this point to say that from the patristic period to the present day some have referred the ΕΥΩ to the Christian<sup>3</sup> and others to the non-Christian.<sup>4</sup>

1. P. Benoit. "La Loi et la Croix d'après Saint Paul" (Rom. VII,7--VIII,4)", Revue Biblique, 47(1938), 484.

2. "Perspectives on Paul", 1971, p.65. cf. p.66: "It cannot be seriously disputed that salvation history forms the horizon of Pauline theology". Käsemann goes on to investigate what this "horizon" means, especially in relation to justification by faith. cf. pp.67, 68f, 74ff, 23.

3. Including: only Methodius among the Greek Fathers; Hieronymus, Augustine (in his second period), Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, H. Pretorius, M. Goguel, K. Barth, A. Nygren, J.G. McKenzie, F.F. Bruce, J. Murray, J.D.G. Dunn.

4. Including: Tertullian, Origen and most of the Greek Fathers, Augustine (in his early period), Pelagius, J. Wesley, F.C. Baur and the "Tübingen School" generally, H.St.J. Thackeray, J. Denney, E. Kuhl, H. Lietzmann, A. Deissmann, A.E. Garvie, A.S. Peake, W.G. Kummel, R. Bultmann, J. Moffatt, C.H. Dodd, J.S. Stewart, P. Bläser, G. Bornkamm, C.K. Barrett, H. Braun.



2. Some Recent Contributions of Special Significance to the Understanding of the  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  in 7:7-25.

The most notable contribution to the study of 7:7-25 in modern times is W.G. Kummel's volume<sup>1.</sup> which we regard as the water-shed of recent discussion. The virtues of his work are many - his many-sided approach to his subject, careful exegesis, attention to the epistolary context, wide acquaintance with the history of interpretation, extensive knowledge of ancient literary precedents, prodigious knowledge of the relevant literature, a sense of the integrity of the passage within the life experience of Paul. Kummel's work is a basic text, in our opinion the basic text, for anyone who would grapple with the problems of 7:7-25. The absence of an English translation has been a handicap for many writers on the subject, as has also the difficulty of obtaining the German text of 1929. We have formed the impression that many of those who dismiss Kummel's view do not show evidence of an adequate knowledge of his monograph, but appear to be working at second hand from isolated quotations only and sometimes not even that. We suggest that those who have an intimate acquaintance with Romer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus are less likely to support the autobiographical understanding of the passage, and its application to the Christian.

---

1. "Romer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus", 1929. His later work "Man in the New Testament", revised edition 1963, requires no changes of significance for the understanding presented in the earlier book, cf. pp.49ff.

Kummel contributes to the understanding of the form of the passage by identifying the <sup>2</sup> εὐα as a "Stilform", that is, a technical literary device. We do not think that he goes far enough in his understanding of the literary form and submit that our more developed view of 7:7-25, as an interlude cast in an explicit dramatic form, is more satisfactory, and is in fact not unrelated to the "Stilform" approach. We find Kummel's denial of an autobiographical reference in 7:7ff compellingly argued. We also however reject his rejection of a Genesis reference in the passage and we disagree strongly with his restriction of νόμος to the Mosaic Law. We can borrow much from his classic work in our interest and build from it. The study of Romans 7:7-25 may and must go beyond Kummel but (to adapt a saying of J. Baillie concerning K. Barth), "it must go through him and not round him".

Careful attention must also be paid to the contribution of R. Bultmann<sup>1</sup> to the study of 7:7-25. He accepts Kummel's conclusions as his starting-point and goes on to make a supplement of his own. Bultmann maintains that the traditional interpretation of the dichotomy in vv15-20 is based on a wrong understanding of Paul's anthropology.<sup>2</sup> He calls this

---

1. In particular in "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", Imago Dei. Beiträge zur theol. Anthropologie. Gustav Krüger zum 70. Geburtstage, 1932, pp.52-62; also to be found in "Exegetica", 1967, pp.198-209 (E.T., "Existence and Faith", 1961, pp.147-157, and also "The Old and New Man in the Letters of Paul", (no date), pp.33-48). Our references are to "Exegetica", 1967.

2. Bultmann's assertion that the portrayal in 7:7-25 is from the standpoint of faith reflects his wider view that Paul's theology is to be understood as anthropology. This means that Paul understands God in relation to man, and man in relation to God, so that man is what he is always within his relationship with God. Paul's anthropology is in two parts according to this view. There is a "before" and an "after". There is man prior to faith and man under faith but the former can be truly understood only from within the standpoint of faith. The presentation in 7:7-25 is therefore a particular case of the general theological-anthropological standpoint of Paul as Bultmann understands it. cf. "Existence and Faith", 1961, pp.127f.

false view "subjective" and ever against it asserts a "transcendent" or "trans-subjective" anthropology. "Der Mensch ist von Paulus garnicht primar als bewusstes Subjekt gesehen; die Tendenzen seines <sup>l</sup>Wolens und Tuns, die dem Menschen seinen Charakter geben, sind garnicht die Strebungen seiner Subjektivitat. Das menschlichen Sein transzendiert vielmehr nach Paulus die Sphäre seiner Bewusstheit. Das kommt ja sehr deutlich darin zum Ausdruck, dass nach Paulus der Mensch entweder unter der Herrschaft der ἐσθή oder πνεύματος will und handelt (zB Rom 8:5ff 12ff; Gal 5:16ff); tertium non datur."<sup>1</sup> He claims that we are dealing in 7:7ff with the cardinal, transcendent, antithetical powers, the flesh and the Spirit; with the possibilities of historical existence open to man under these; ultimately with the eschatological salvation with its eschatological possibilities of ζωή and ἀνάστασις. He shows how the sequence of thought in the Epistle, from 1:18 on, is developed in different ways in terms of this basic antithesis. 7:7-25 is about this eschatological tension.<sup>2</sup>

1. Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", 1967, p.201.

2. Exegetically Bultmann argues thus. κατεργάζομαι means to produce, bring about, yield. It controls the meaning of πράβω and ποιῶ which do not refer to transgressions of the commandment but are understood nomistically and so may produce either law-abiding or law-breaking. It is the service of the law as such and not just its transgression that is in view. The intention of becoming righteous before God through the law lies hidden in πράβω and ποιῶ. "Der Mensch ist Sünder, auch wenn er das Gebot erfüllt" (Römer 7 ..... p.206). It should be noted, against A. van Dülmen, that Bultmann denies that his interpretation stands or falls according to the sense of κατεργάζομαι ("Theology of the New Testament", 1965, 1, p.248). Encounter with the law produces ἐπιθυμία not παράβασις. ἐέλω is not the conscious willing of specific acts but the hidden or innermost tendency of the self, that is, what he wills at heart. It is the transcendent tendency of human existence in general towards life and self

There are three great virtues in Bultmann's understanding of our passage. He helps us to lift it away from the psychological level to a theological one. He affirms the unity between 7:7-25 and 5:12-21. He develops the thought of 7:14ff strictly in terms of vv7-13, so that the trans-subjective reference of the powers opposing the "I" in vv7-13 controls our understanding of the conflict in vv15-20. We might say in fact that Bultmann has done for the theological understanding of the passage what Kummel did for the exegetical understanding.

There has been sharp difference of opinion over the years regarding the presence of a Genesis reference in 7:7-25. S. Lyonnet<sup>1</sup> reinforces the view that a Genesis allusion does indeed lie within the passage. He is concerned in particular with the οὐκ ἐπιθυμῆεις of 7:7. We think his case is well made and that, joined to the cumulative evidence of a Genesis reference in vv9 and 11, it is convincing. We have then to recognise the implications of the Genesis background for

---

(cont'd) continuance. This may certainly be expressed in conscious desires and deeds, but it goes deeper to the very nature of the self, thus determining its character. It is one and the same thing to affirm the dichotomy and to affirm the real nature of the self. Conversely real existence is the surrender of the self to God's claim. The problem therefore goes deeper than the mere frustration of good intentions and a failure to produce corresponding actions. "...alles Tun ist von vornherein gegen seine eigene und eigentliche Intention gerichtet" (Römer 7... p.207). The object of θέλω is thus ζωή, and not fulfilment of the ἐντολή. What in fact emerges in the πράξω and ποιῶ is θάνατος. The ἀγαθόν and the καλόν are ζωή and not moral good, while the κακόν is θάνατος, and not moral evil. They may be these of course, at a further remove. ἐὐνοῖα and ἐὐνοῦμεν are the affirmation of the basic intention of the law which is to lead to life.

1. "Tu ne Convoiteras Pas. Rom VII.7", *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Freundesgabe Oscar Cullmann*, ed. W.C.van Unnik, 1962, pp.157-165. See also his "L'Histoire du Salut selon le Chapitre VII de l'Épître aux Romains", *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 117-151.

exegesis and interpretation. We are also better able to appreciate the salvation history standpoint and the multiple use of the term voûes .

P. Benoit,<sup>1.</sup> alone of all the writers on Romans whom we have studied, seems to grasp what we hold to be the basic literary pattern of the passage. He speaks of a cosmic drama portrayed in 7:7-25 which revives and expands the "personnifications historiques"<sup>2.</sup> of Romans 6, namely, sin and death. He ties 7:7ff and 5:12ff very firmly together. They are both concerned with the general plan of the history of salvation in which the personified powers struggle for dominion over man, nevertheless the sanctity of the plan of God is preserved. The dramatic structure as we see it has a different form from that which Benoit presents, sometimes imprecisely, but we hold that he has moved beyond Kummel in the right direction.

The essay of E. Ellwein<sup>3.</sup> is valuable, not for any originality in his treatment of the theme but for his comprehensive review of the problems of 7:7ff with wide historical reference. He makes a helpful attempt, with acknowledgement to Bengel, to give full weight to the eschatological tension in the Christian life. His final conclusion is worth careful study. We are impressed in his summing-up by the modesty of his approach; his recognition of the oscillation in faith between victory and relapse; his emphasis on the superior power of the Gospel .

1. "La Loi et La Croix D'Après Saint Paul", Revue Biblique, 47 (1938), 481-509.

2. *ibid.* p.486 nl.

3. "Das Rätsel von Römer VII", Kerugma und Dogma, 1, (1955), 247-268.

word to reinforce the "sweet miracle"; his grasp of the intrusion of the vertical dimension into the horizontal, and the devotional and practical relevance which he uncovers in 7:7-25.

C.L. Mitton's three articles<sup>1</sup> are helpful for their careful assessment of A. Nygren's position. The latter represents the Augustine-Luther tradition in its most impressive modern statement. We think that the stress on לוֹטֹס עַיִן as the key which unlocks the problem is exaggerated and that Mitton tends to want the best of all worlds in reaching his conclusion. But the result of his contribution is to encourage qualified respect for Nygren's restatement and to demand more attention to the eschatological tension which is so important for the correct understanding.

Study of the relation of the "I"-form to the Qumran texts has lodged us more firmly in the Jewish background of 7:7ff and rescued us from the temptation to wander in the by-paths of Gnosticism and the like. We have not found any major point of departure for any new understanding of 7:7-25 in the direction of Qumran. As far as the "I"-style is concerned K.G. Kuhn's essay<sup>2</sup> is most to the point. He claims to demonstrate a use of the pronoun "I" in 1QS XI:7-10 (and also in the Qumran Hymns) which corresponds both in style and in theological connotation to

1. "Romans vii Reconsidered", Expository Times, 65 (1953-4), 78-81; 99-103; 132-135. C.E.B. Cranfield offers an objection to Mitton's view in Expository Times, 65 (1953-4), 221.

2. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, 1958, pp.94-113, 265-270. The article is a translation with some revisions from Z.Th.K., 49 (1952), 200-222.



the "I"-form of Romans 7:7ff. He finds "the dualistic power-idea" in the Qumran texts to be a reflection of a similar point of view which lies behind the personifications of Romans 7. H. Braun,<sup>1</sup> working from a much broader base, draws attention to the similarities and dissimilarities between the more general aspects of Paul's theology and that of Qumran. He assesses carefully the content of 7:7ff as compared with the content of the related teaching in the Qumran texts, in particular the confession of sin of the Qumran saint which, he claims, provides explicit parallels to Romans 7.<sup>2</sup> It is the man who is enlightened and liberated who makes confession by means of a vocabulary of sin<sup>3</sup> which is remarkably rich and varied and which includes acknowledgement of sinful existence, not just particular acts of sin. This capacity to understand sin as "being" as well as "action" belongs only to those who have entered into salvation, that is, into the Sect and they confess their vain creatureliness both before and after salvation. There is thus an oscillation in the Qumran saint by which he says "yes" and "no" to the Torah, under the influence of the dualistic powers mythologically conceived. God's gracious help

---

1. "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", *Z.Th.K.* 56 (1959), 1-18. See also his *Qumran und das N.T.*, 1966, 1, pp.177ff.

2. The basic passages on which Braun conducts his study are: 1QH 1:21-34; 3:19-36; 4:27-40; 6:6-12; 7:16-18; 9:8-18; 10:2-12; 12:24-34; 13:13-19; 16:10-12; 18:12-15, 22-29. 1QS 1:24-2:1; 10:10-13; 11:7, 9-22.

3. Braun assembles this vocabulary, *op. cit.* pp.4ff.

consists in strengthening the saint to say "yes" to the Torah.<sup>1.</sup> Braun finds that both Romans 7 and Qumran teach the extreme sinfulness of man; they both locate salvation in the saving act of the gracious God; they both regard salvation as an emphatic contrast to the past, hopeless situation; they both allow for transgression and weakness in the saint.<sup>2.</sup> There is also however an important difference in the concept of salvation. In Paul, God's saving act frees from the Torah, whereas in Qumran it frees for the Torah. Faith then becomes for Paul a decisive "no" to the Torah as the way of salvation, while for Qumran faith is an emphatic "yes" to the Torah.<sup>3.</sup> The split nature of man is understood more radically by Paul than by Qumran. In the latter the "yes" and "no" lie alongside one another within the same "I" of the blessed man, sometimes the one is expressed and sometimes the other. In Romans 7 the only existence of the "I" is in illusion and death.<sup>4.</sup> Braun finds the essential difference between Paul and Qumran in the Christological basis<sup>5.</sup> of salvation in Paul

1. The Torah is all-important in Qumran within the wider framework of grace.

2. Here Braun looks beyond Romans 7 to other Pauline material. He regards 7:7-25 as about life under the law and not under the Spirit.

3. cf. O. Michel, "Der Brief an die Römer", 1966, p.184, on the agreement and difference between Paul and Qumran.

4. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., succeeds in bringing this out clearly.

5. op. cit., p.17. cf. M. Black, "The Scrolls and Christianity", 1969, p.106; K. Stendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament", 1958 pp.16f; W. Grundmann, "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul", Paul and Qumran, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor, 1968, p.114; P. Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament", *ibid.* p.30; F.F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity", N.T.S., 2 (1955-56), 192.

which made necessary for him a radical critique of the Torah, in other words it is a difference ultimately in the doctrine of grace.

### 3. Other Uses of the <sup>2</sup> εγω in Paul's Epistles.

We first quote from Blass-Debrunner-Funk: "The 1st and 2nd person sing. used to represent any third person in order to illustrate something universal in a vivid manner by reference to a single individual, as though present, does not appear in Greek as frequently as in other languages; it apparently occurs in Greek literature for the first time in the late classical period (as a peculiarity of animated colloquial language). Paul furnishes several examples, especially R 7:7ff ..... later in 8:2 ἡλευθέρωέν εε (SBFG, others με) the 2nd person is again used in a universal sense".<sup>1</sup>

W.G. Kümmel<sup>2</sup> gives two sets of Pauline references through which he makes an approach to the problem of the "I" in 7:7ff. The first list is of the cohortative or interrogative use of the first person plural in Paul and comprises Rom. 3:8b; 6:1, 15; 13:12, 13; 14:13; 1 Cor. 10: 8, 9, 22; 2 Cor. 7:1; Gal. 5:25f.; 1 Thess. 5:6, 8-10. These instances show a degree of liberty in the use of the first person which extends

1. op. cit., p.147, para. 281.

2. op. cit., pp.121-124.

beyond Paul himself. The second list is of passages in which the first person singular occurs as a stylistic form and comprises Rom. 3:5, 7; 1 Cor. 6:12, 15; 10:29f.; 11:31f; 13:1-3, 11f.; 14:11, 14, 15; Gal. 2:18. In some cases there is controversy over the specific interpretation of particular texts.<sup>1</sup> The second of Kummel's series comes closer to Romans 7:7ff than does the first. The use of the "I" in this second list has been variously described as gnomic, aphoristic, timeless, general, exemplary, paradigmatic, a general maxim, universally valid. It is not necessary to suppose that in every case there can be no relation of any kind whatever to Paul himself.

Kummel rightly insists that in each case the content of the verse or verses to which reference is made is decisive for the interpretation. Similarly the content of Romans 7:7ff is decisive and external factors must take second place. Exegesis is primary in the study of the passage, both analytical in which we take the passage to pieces and synthetical in which we construct clarifying principles. Kummel concludes<sup>2</sup> that the "I" is a stylistic form. Paul is expressing a universal idea in a lively way through the first person. In the case of 7:7ff the universal idea in question is that the law can only lead to death because it must

1. cf. C.H. Dodd, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans", 1932, pp.105ff on 1 Cor. 14:6-19 and Gal. 2:19-21. We disagree with Dodd on Gal. 2:18, see rather E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, p.357; Blass-Debrunner-Funk, op. cit., para. 281 and R.N. Longenecker's criticism of C.H. Dodd ("Paul Apostle of Liberty", 1964, p.89 n7). Longenecker, op. cit., pp.89f takes Rom. 3:7; 1 Cor. 13:1-3; 6:15 as examples of the *εγω* used in a general sense. He regards 1 Cor. 14:11, 14, 15 as probable and Gal. 2:18-21 as possible instances.

2. op. cit., p.124: "Dann blieb aber für sie nur die Lösung übrig, dass das Ich eine Stilform sei, d.h. dass Paulus einen allgemeinen Gedanken durch die 1. Person lebendig ausdrücke".

serve as a handle for sin. We will indicate in detail why we have felt it necessary to extend Kummel's view and recognise an extended figure which we have called a dramatisation. We may put it differently and say that we should not study the εἶναι on its own but within the larger setting. We have to come at the εἶναι through the passage and not at the passage through the εἶναι.

Other uses of the εἶναι in Paul point us in the right direction, especially Gal. 2:18 and 1 Cor. 13, towards a gnomic, general use. None of them however is identical with 7:7ff. There is no other example in Paul of this particular sustained figure. In Gal. 2:18 a brief comment only is made in order to establish a limited point in an Epistle which is highly polemical in character. In the Pauline writings 7:7ff has friends but no relatives.

#### 4. The "I"-form in Jewish and Other Literature.

We need spend little time in considering Greek and Latin literature. The use of the "I"-form "does not appear in Greek as frequently as in other languages; it apparently occurs in Greek literature for the first time in the late classical period (as a peculiarity of animated colloquial language)".<sup>1</sup> W.G. Kummel<sup>2</sup> quotes sparse instances only from Demosthenes and Pseudo-Xenophon and then two references from

---

1. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, op. cit., para.281.

2. op. cit., pp.126-128.

Horace. These indicate occasional use of this stylistic form in Greek and in Latin. The area on which we must concentrate for related antecedents as to literary form and theological content is the Jewish background.

In the Old Testament the Psalms show a use of the first person singular which is distantly related to that of Romans 7:7ff. In them however the note of fundamental despair which we meet in the climax of Romans 7 is lacking. Apparent exceptions proceed from the mood of a personal moment or from the exigencies of the liturgy. Despair is not a terminus. The Psalms comprise the praise and prayer book of the people of God in which they rehearse who they are and what has happened to them. They are the people of the covenant under the mercy and faithfulness of the Lord and therefore theological despair is out of place, although psychological melancholy and liturgical confession are not. The form of presentation in which one stands for all and represents all is therefore, with this important proviso, familiar to us from the Psalms. "Jewish piety was used to hearing the psalmist speak in the first person to express, nevertheless, a state of mind which was common to all believing Israel; the 'I' or 'me' served to make more concrete and living an experience which was quite general and collective. One individual spoke out what all thought; in speaking of himself he spoke of man in general; when he said 'I' he implied 'we'."<sup>1</sup>

---

1. F.J. Leenhardt, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1961, p.184, cf. O. Michel, op. cit., p.183; K.G. Kuhn, "The Scrolls and the New Testament", ed. K. Stendahl, 1958, p.102; J. Blank, "Der gespaltene Mensch", Bibel und Leben, 1968, p.12 n2; H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality", Werden und Wesen, 1936, pp.57f; see especially U. Luz, "Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus", 1968, p.159, n87.



A similar use of the "I" is before us in Isaiah 50:4-9, where the exile in his humiliation exemplifies in himself the experience of Israel and expresses his plight in a song of faith in which the individual speaks for all the people.<sup>1.</sup>

W.G. Kummel draws attention<sup>2.</sup> to three examples of the "I"-form in the Rabbinic debate. He gives reference, text and translation in each case.

a). Berakoth 1:3. This concerns the journey of Rabbi Tarphon which became hazardous when he assumed a reclining position in order to read the Shema. Kummel asserts that it was usual in rabbinic circles to argue by stories of this kind in the first person.

b). Berakoth 3a (Gemara). A vision of Elijah, expressed in the first person, is used to interpret a general rabbinic rule.

c). Pirke Aboth 6:9b. The travelling Rabbi Jose b.Kisma is offered a fortune as an inducement to change his abode. He declines in order to dwell where the law is. Here again, and most clearly of the three examples, the first person is used in a context of argument and in a figurative sense. The story illustrates the idea of the supreme worth of the Law.

1. cf. D.R. Jones, "Peake 1962", p.525, para.454 h; also H. Wheeler Robinson, op. cit., pp.58ff. The debate on the identity of the Servant, in Isaiah bears strong resemblances to the debate on the identity of the Eyō in 7:7ff. We shall return later to the concept of solidarity and its relation to 7:7ff.

2. op. cit., pp.128ff.

3. The Talmudic references are to be found respectively in "The Babylonian Talmud", ed. I. Epstein: Berakoth (Gemara) 11a (Seder Zera'im, 1, 1948, p.63); Berakoth 3a (Gemara), (Seder Zera'im 1, 1948, pp.6f); Aboth Baraitha 9, (Seder Nezikin VIII, 1935, pp.88f.

These three examples, whether they are based on fact or fiction is immaterial, illustrate general teaching by means of the first person.<sup>1.</sup>

Kummel also quotes<sup>2.</sup> a use of the first person in a stylistic form which gives general teaching from Philo.<sup>3.</sup> Here, without any change in subject matter, there is a change from the first person plural to the first person singular. We should note however that Kummel claims no more than evidence of the presence of the "I"-form in Jewish literature and therefore the possibility of such stylistic form. Whatever we adduce from Jewish literature regarding the form of Romans 7:7ff, its content is certainly Jewish and Biblical through and through.<sup>4.</sup>

The reference sometimes made to the late first century A.D. authors of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch for the interpretation of Romans 7,<sup>5.</sup> concerns the theological content of these texts and not the "I"-form specifically,

1. Note R.N. Longenecker's warning, op. cit., p.88, concerning the late date of these passages, which is about 120-140 A.D. cf. A.S. Peake, "The Quintessence of Paulinism", B.J.R.L., 4, 1917-18, 289f; A. Schweitzer, "Paul and His Interpreters", 1912, p.48; G.B. Caird, "The Apostolic Age", 1955, p.27: "First century Judaism was not identical with the religion of the Mishna as G.F. Moore Claims".

2. op. cit., pp.131f.

3. De Somn. 1:77.

4. cf. O. Michel, op. cit., p.183; S.E. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline", H.T.R., 48 (1955), 165. W.D. Davies finds a reflection of the rabbinic idea of the Two Impulses in 7:7ff, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, pp.23ff. (cf. his "Christian Origins and Judaism", 1962, p.155.) We wonder if there is a connection, even of a remote and unconscious nature, between the ἐγὼ λέγεις of 7:7ff and the ἐγὼ μενοεικας of 1 Kings 19:10, 14 LXX. In that case the theological despair of Romans might relate to the psychological despair of Elijah.

5. cf. W.D. Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, pp.32ff.

and so we shall not pursue this line. In 4 Ezra conflict occasioned by the Law, solidarity between speaker and his people and anguished cry all make their appearance.

The Hebrew texts of the unorthodox "covenanter" Sect at Qumran have thrown fresh light on the interpretation of Romans 7. R.N. Longenecker comments,<sup>1</sup> "... it is here that we have the most significant outside aid to the understanding of Romans 7". We should not however exaggerate this contribution. We do not think for instance that Kümmel's monograph would have moved away in significant respects from its position, by the study of this new material. It is a case of additional confirmation rather than radical alteration.

For our present purpose it is sufficient to point to three ways in which the writings of the Judean Desert community help our study.

1. In Romans 7:7ff we have the four characters law, sin, death, and "I", confronting one another in what we hope to establish as a dramatic presentation. Behind this literary form lies a basic theological mode of understanding which envisages a state of war between opposing powers. This dualism<sup>2</sup> may be expressed in whatever terms the adopted standpoint requires, as an antagonism between good and evil powers, principles or

1. op. cit., p.88.

2. According to D. Winston, "The Iranian Component in the Bible, Apocrypha, and Qumran: A Review of the Evidence", History of Religions, 5 (1965-66), 185 n4, the term "dualismus" was coined by T. Hyde in a work on Persian religion published in 1700. A helpful definition of various types of dualistic thought is given by J.H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 111, 13-1V, 26 and the 'Dualism' contained in the Fourth Gospel", N.T.S., 15 (1968-69), 389 n1. cf. P.S. Minear, "The Obedience of Faith", 1971, p.63.

spirits; between God and sin; between God and the world; ultimately between God and Satan. In Romans 7:7ff the antagonism is between God and sin. The service of God and the service of sin have already been before us in Romans 6, in which the μελὶ of the individual are the ἐπι employed in the service of God or of sin.

We find this same image of the conflicting powers in the Qumran literature. There are problems however in determining the type of dualism which the texts present and in identifying the source from which it derives. The argument concerns in particular, although by no means entirely, the passage 1QS 3:13-4:26, in which we learn of the two spirits and the two ways. The consensus of opinion<sup>1</sup> is that the passage reveals a cosmic dualism of the kind which Charlesworth defines<sup>2</sup> as "the conception of two opposing celestial spirits or two distinct and present divisions of the universe". Charlesworth outlines the structure of thought in 1QS 3:13ff and indicates other Qumran texts in which a similar dualism is present. He identifies seven main features in its dualism in which cosmic principles are presented mythologically and concludes<sup>3</sup>, "... the treatise presents a modified cosmic dualism, under which is a subordinate ethical dualism, and whose most conspicuous characteristic is the light-darkness paradigm, and most important feature is the eschatological dimension".

1. J.H. Charlesworth, *op. cit.*, p.395 n3, lists many references, as does W. Foerster, T.D.N.T., 7, p.152 n3 in his article on ἐπι.

2. *op. cit.*, p.389 n1.

3. *ibid.* p.402.

P. Wernberg-Møller<sup>1.</sup> represents the contrary opinion that 1QS 3:13-4:26 must be interpreted psychologically. The two spirits which are portrayed are two radically opposed dispositions or temperaments or moods in man. These good and bad spirits or dispositions are present in every individual from the creation and are active both before and after admission to the Sect as evidenced by the difference between what the saints are ideally and actually. Thus mankind is not divided into two contrasting parts. The covenanters belong to mankind from which they are not separated by a dualistic division. Their difference from others lies rather in their election by God and their adherence to the Torah. On this view evil results from man allowing his perverse disposition to determine his behaviour although to start with the two dispositions are equally balanced. Wernberg-Møller denies that 1QS 3:13-4:26 is a separate literary unit, having perhaps a previous independent existence,<sup>2.</sup> in view of the close connection between the passage and the context,<sup>3.</sup> both in phraseology and ideology and also with other passages, in particular 1QS XI and certain Hymns. He bases his conclusion on detailed exegesis in which he can find no objective dualism and no doctrine of predestination.

1. "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community. 1Q Serek III, 13-IV, 26)", Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961-2), 413-441. J.H. Charlesworth, op. cit., p.395, notes that in the view which he represents "it is readily conceded that the cosmic dualism does break into the so-called 'psychological' arena of each man", so that an ethical dualism exists within the cosmic. The meaning of ןןןןן in 1QS 3:19 is an important issue and whether it is synonymous with ןןן.

2. cf. M. Wilcox, "Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition", The Scrolls and Christianity, ed. M. Black, 1969, p.84: "This passage looks like a kind of 'creed' or block of special teaching". W.D. Davies remarks that this passage summarises the theology of the Sect, "Christian Origins and Judaism", 1962, p.103.

3. In particular 2:25-3:12.

We have been convinced by the arguments in favour of a cosmic dualism in the Sect documents. It is more difficult however to decide the origin of this standpoint. Two main possibilities<sup>1.</sup> are open to us. We can look to Persian influence which some claim to be able to demonstrate in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha and Qumran.<sup>2.</sup> This may have found its way into Judaism from three sources. It may have come directly from travellers on the caravan route<sup>3.</sup> between Persia<sup>and</sup> Egypt which transected Palestine, or through Babylonian Jews<sup>4.</sup> returning home intermittently in the second century B.C. On the other hand it may have percolated into Judaism through Persian influence in Mithraism which was widespread in Asia Minor following the Magian emigration in the fifth century.<sup>5.</sup> D. Winston maintains<sup>6.</sup> that the dualism of IQS reflects the chief doctrine

1. Against a gnostic environment for the Qumran texts see P. Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p.414 n4; M. Wilcox, op. cit., pp.87ff.

2. D. Winston, op. cit., finds Iranian influence in 2 Isaiah and Daniel and in the Apocrypha. He claims a "strong probability for an Iranian penetration into Qumran" (p.187) through its preoccupation with apocryphal texts. He lists writers who support an Iranian influence (p.201 n47). cf. K.G. Kuhn, op. cit., pp.98ff (this article, "New Light on Temptation...", is a translation with revisions from Z.Th.K., 49 (1952), pp.200-222, see also his earlier essay, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebraischen Texte und das Neue Testament", Z.Th.K., 47 (1950), pp.192-211); W. Foerster, op. cit., p.152.

3. so J.H. Charlesworth, op. cit., p.401.

4. so W.F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 140 (1955), 27ff.

5. so D. Winston, op. cit., p.191.

6. *ibid.* pp.200ff.



of Zoroastrianism which is its "dualistic splitting of the cosmos between two opposing forces". In the Zurvanite heterodoxy<sup>1</sup> such a dualism exists in a form which was modified by monotheism and this would be amenable to the Jewish mind in a way that an ultimate dualism would not.<sup>2</sup> Zurvanism also displays the predestination and the light-darkness paradigm of IQS. This type of Iranian dualism differs from the Greek and Gnostic forms in consequence of its monotheism, in its positive attitude to matter and to the body. These are regarded as good creations which have been attacked by evil from without. The conflict is then located in the struggle between the mythological powers of light and darkness.

On the other hand we may decline to look beyond the Old Testament and mainstream Judaism for the origin of the dualism,<sup>3</sup> which is then regarded as an internal development of Jewish thought within its basic monotheism. M. Black<sup>4</sup> derives the concept from the apocalyptic books. P. Wernberg-Møller refuses any Persian influence and looks in particular

1. Zurvan is the God of Time or Destiny, father of Ohrmazd and Ahriman, who transcends the spirit of light and the spirit of darkness. The system of thought was current in Iran in the 4th century B.C. This monotheism offered an attractive solution to the problem of evil in the shape of an evil spirit affecting man, which is nevertheless subordinate to God. It was probably predominant when Essene thought developed. On Zoroastrianism cf. W. Fairweather, "The Background of the Epistle", 1935, pp.273ff.

2. cf. M. Wilcox, op. cit., p.86.

3. It is not difficult to derive the light-darkness antithesis from Gen. 1:3-5. Charlesworth himself suggests an evolutionary development in the concept of Satan from the Book of Job to the Martyrdom of Isaiah (dated somewhere between the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D.). cf. the arguments advanced by M. Wilcox, op. cit., pp.86ff.

4. "The Scrolls and Christian Origins", 1961, p.134. He instances The Testament of Judah, XX. cf. W. Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", 1926, p.295.

to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs<sup>1.</sup> and to writings which originated in the same period and from the same cultural and geographical environment as the Qumran writings.<sup>2.</sup>

The most we feel able to say with certainty regarding the origin of the dualism in IQS 3:13ff and other Qumran texts, is that a relationship between Jewish and Iranian doctrines is possible, but the debate has not produced a conclusive result. There is a good deal of conjecture in attempting to proceed from the undoubted dualism in Persian sources to its appearance in Jewish documents. Direct literary connections would offer a firmer basis than the channels of communication already mentioned. Reference to caravan routes, Mithraism and returning Jews leaves wide gaps in the process of communication. It is easier to show existence of parallels than to demonstrate dependence.<sup>3.</sup> Further, the dates of the Persian texts and the development of religious thought are difficult to determine precisely. If such an influence is present in Qumran it must be an unconscious one, in view of the exclusive nature of this fiercely Jewish Sect. Even D. Winston in his lengthy and heavily documented article

1. op. cit., p.417 n7. In T. Reuben 2:1-3:7, we find the seven spirits of deceit which are appointed against man and seven other spirits given to man at his creation and an eighth spirit of sleep, with all of which are mingled the spirits of error. In T. Judah 20:1, we have the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit which wait upon man. In T. Asher 1:3-9, we learn of the two ways or inclinations or kinds or modes of action given by God to the sons of men. v4 says, "all things are by two's, one over against the other". cf. R.H. Charles, "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English", 2, 1913 pp.296-8; 322;343.

2. He also stresses the psychological use of 117 both in the O.T. and in the N.T. The argument between Wernberg-Møller and Charlesworth is partly one of methodology - cf. Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., pp.415 n5, 416.

3. E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, p.82, in a wider context, warns against converting parallels into influences and influences into sources. cf. F. Cumont, quoted A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p.194.

speaks cautiously and concludes<sup>1.</sup> that the Iranian impact was "along the periphery of Judaism only". We therefore reject Wernberg-Møller's view of the nature of the dualism in 1QS 3:13ff. At the same time we regard an Iranian origin as a possibility but not as a certainty. The case is at best "not proven".

There is no question of direct dependence on Qumran on the part of Paul in respect of the dualism presented in Romans 7. Paul is drawing on a heritage in Judaism which was common to himself and to the Sect and one which was modified by both. In Romans 7 he applies it in a way which is inventive in literary form within the over-all purpose of his Epistle.

2. We now consider a further way in which Qumran is of interest for our purpose. We find explicit parallels to the "I"-form within the dualistic standpoint in Qumran. In 1QS, columns X and XI, the eternal blessings and privileges of the elect are set out. The enumeration is interrupted by the exclamation,<sup>2.</sup> "As for me,

I belong to wicked mankind,  
to the company of ungodly flesh,  
My iniquities, rebellions, and sins,  
together with the perversity of my heart,  
belong to the company of worms  
and to those who walk in darkness."

The context, as well as similar expressions in the Hymns,<sup>3.</sup> makes it clear that the Sect member is speaking. He is aware both of his election with

1. op. cit., p.210. The essentially Jewish nature of 1QS 3:13ff is not in dispute between Charlesworth and Wernberg-Møller.

2. The translation is that of G. Vermes, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in English", 1968, p.93.

3. eg. 1QH 1:21-23; 3:24-36.

its blessings and also of his sinfulness.<sup>1.</sup>

On this passage, IQS X and XI, K.G. Kuhn affirms,<sup>2.</sup> "Most important for the New Testament is the 'I'-style of this saying. We have in this text the same 'I' as in Rom.7; it is the same 'I' not only in regard to style, but especially in regard to theological connotations: 'I' is here, just as in Rom.7, not meant individually or biographically; it is gnomic, descriptive of human existence. The 'I' in this Qumran passage, as in Rom.7, signifies the existence of mankind, which is flesh. Man is flesh because and inasmuch as he sins and thereby stands under ungodly power".

Kuhn writes<sup>3.</sup> with regard to the similar occurrences in the Hymns, "This 'I'-style of the Qumran Hymns is evidently connected with the 'I'-style of the Old Testament psalms and, from the point of view of form, this genre is here developed further. In the Qumran texts, however, the 'I'-sayings appear within the framework of the dualistic power-idea, and are, therefore, essentially different from the Old Testament. In the Qumran setting, the 'I' represents the human existence as 'flesh' in the sense of man's belonging to the sphere of the power of the ungodly. Because of this completely new accent and meaning of the 'I'-sayings, it is the Qumran texts rather than the Old Testament psalms which offer the true and immediate parallel to the 'I'-sayings of Rom.7.".

1. cf. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., pp.88f.

2. "New Light on Temptation, ~~and~~ and Flesh in the New Testament", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, 1958, pp.102f.

3. *ibid.* pp.102f.

Our conclusion is that the Qumran texts provide confirmation that the stylistic 'I' was known within this unorthodox Sect of Judaism and in a more developed form than that of the Old Testament Psalms.

3. In the third place the Qumran texts warn us against looking too naively to Hellenism in general and to Gnosticism in particular in Pauline studies and in the understanding of Romans 7. K. Stendahl<sup>1</sup> makes the vigorous statement, "It has often been said that the Dead Sea Scrolls add substantially to our knowledge of the Jewish background of Christianity. On this point there is universal agreement. This is significant enough. It means, among other things, that both the Pauline and the Johannine literature can be understood in their Jewish background and that many of the odysseys of scholars some decades ago over the deep waters of Hellenistic philosophy and religion were more fascinating than they were rewarding".

---

1. "The Scrolls and The New Testament: An Introduction and A Perspective", The Scrolls and the New Testament, 1958, p.5. cf. K.G. Kuhn, op. cit., p.104, "We see now how the pattern of the two powers, which is highly developed in the New Testament, belongs to the Jewish Palestinian tradition found at Qumran. That means that it does not come from Hellenism or from Gnosticism, a fact with great bearing on Pauline studies, and especially on our understanding of Rom. 6 and 7, where the concept of the two powers determines the entire logic". cf. H. Braun, "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", Z.Th.K., 56 (1959), 1; and also his "Qumran und das N.T.", 1966, 1, pp.177f; R.E. Brown, "Second Thoughts: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament", Expository Times, 78 (1966), 19ff.

## 5. The $\epsilon\chi\omega$ in the Interpretation of 7:7-25.

In order to interpret 7:7-25 correctly, we must reach conclusions on issues concerning the  $\epsilon\chi\omega$  which have been much debated down the years. We shall consider in turn the primary theme of 7:7-25; the  $\epsilon\chi\omega$  in relation to the Christian; the  $\epsilon\chi\omega$  in relation to Paul; and finally the standpoint of the passage. We shall return to these questions in points of detail when we come to exegesis.

### a. The Primary Theme of the Passage.

The identity of the  $\epsilon\chi\omega$  is not the burning issue in our understanding of 7:7-25.<sup>1</sup> The "I" is part of a literary device which as a whole is designed to enable us to understand the purpose of the law in God's plan of salvation. We must not allow the device to obscure the intention for which it was contrived and the extended figure of which it is part.

The two rhetorical questions in v7 and v13 are significant. The question in v7 throws the emphasis on the relation between the law and sin in vv7-11, while that in v13 throws the emphasis on the relation between the law and death in vv12f. For further clarification these relationships are expounded over again but by a different technique

---

1. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.36, is correct in saying that the most controversial problem in the exegesis of Chapter 7 has been the identity of the subject, but that the most important question is in fact, "Why the law?" of C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.140, (also p.152), "It is in the last resort the meaning of religion that is analysed here", and similar remarks on a broader basis in his "New Testament Eschatology: II, The Gospels", S.J.T., 6 (1953), 239f. Also cf. W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.159, "St. Paul has set the stage for an enquiry dictated by a purely argumentative necessity. What is life under the law according to the logic of its nature?" Manson underlines the last sentence.



within the over-all dramatic device. This is another way of saying that the same "I" is before us throughout the passage. The "I" who has encountered the other characters in the role-playing, action sequences of vv7-11 and vv12f, reflects aloud in vv14-24 on the effects within himself of that encounter. The "I" soliloquises but still with reference to the controlling question, "What is the purpose of the law?" The summary ( 2px cov ) in v25b states the basic antithetical laws which are in view from v14, which has itself in turn resumed the discussion of vv7-13. The theme of the passage therefore is the law and not the "I". The analysis is worked out in a theological exercise<sup>1</sup> which has an eschatological background and a salvation history reference. The role assigned to the law is shown in and only in the encounter of the law with the other characters.

It is not therefore the primary intention of the passage to establish the nature either of the Christian life or of the non-Christian life. It is primarily a defence of the law.<sup>2</sup> A piece of brisk theological

1. cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.198; E. Brunner, "The Letter to the Romans", 1959, p.59.

2. So W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.9, 11, 61, 84; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp.88f; M.-J. Lagrange, "Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains", 1950, p.166; P. Benoit, "La Loi..." p.503 nl; K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", H.T.R., 56 (1963), 212; E. Ellwein, op. cit., p.247; H. Braun, "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", Z.Th.K., 56, (1959), 2. R. Bultmann, "Römer 7 .....", p.205: "Und zwar ist das Motiv dieser Apologie wohl nicht eigentlich die Pietät oder der Gedanke an erschreckte Leser, sondern die klare Einsicht, dass der Schuldcharakter der Sünde preisgegeben wird, wenn die Anerkennung des Gesetzes als der Forderung Gottes hinfällt, an der der Mensch schuldig wird". W. Gotbrod, "Die Paulinische Anthropologie", 1934, pp.46, 116, uses the term "defence" in a rather different sense. He sees vv7ff, not as a defence of the law in its basic intention but as a defence of Paul's rejection of the law as a way of salvation.

skirmishing is before us which, as well as connecting with the earlier ambiguous references to the law in the Epistle, reflects the problem posed to Paul personally and to the early Church in general, concerning the relation of the law to the Gospel and the relation of the Jews to the Gentiles. The law is defended. It is evaluated both positively and negatively. In the process sin is identified as the villain. The passage is thus a defence of the law and conversely an indictment of sin.

W.G. Kummel misleads us when he claims<sup>1</sup> that the conflict in vv15ff becomes a purpose-in-itself and takes over from the defence of the law which was originally in view. On the contrary the conflict in vv15ff is a purpose within a purpose. In terms of literary structure this is to be expressed by a change of scene in the drama and also by the adoption of the soliloquy technique. The conflict is thus an integral part of the whole. The apology for the law runs right through to the end. The entire passage, in its very unusual form, has a single interest which is to clarify the purpose of the law. Every change of scene within the drama, every variation on the theme, every new term recruited in the interest of elucidation (eg. vv22f), is subordinated to the controlling interest - why the law?

The fact that the literary form is unique in Paul underlies much of the difficulty in interpretation. Interpreters have tried to reconcile the portrayal in 7:7ff with other Pauline constructions. This is a mistake. We should on the contrary allow the passage to establish its own canons and define its purpose from within its own perspective. We must understand the passage on its own terms and not in terms imported

---

1. op. cit., p.10.

from outside, which do not belong to the same literary genre. On the other hand of course, the theology of the passage can certainly be illumined from other parts of the Pauline Epistles, in particular from Galatians.

In a secondary sense we are tempted to say that we have also before us a defence of the "I", in that the "I" wills the good, agrees with and delights in and serves the law. This however would be a false perspective. These terms are used in the interest of the law rather than the "I", concerning which much of a contrary nature is said, for instance in vv14, 17, 18, 25b. The "I" then lies within a dramatic device designed to highlight the purpose of the law. We must keep the emphasis on the law, not on the "I" and on the purpose of the whole device, rather than on one part of it.

b. The <sup>2</sup>Εἷς and the Christian.

The broader context, 5:1-8:39, within which the passage lies, concerns the redemption in Christ Jesus. The digression which comprises 7:7-25 however is negative in its standpoint and interrupts the wider reference. It does not share in the positive affirmation of the larger context until v25a which is alien to the main body of the digression and anticipatory of what follows. A. Nygren argues<sup>1</sup> that Chapters 5-8 are about life in Christ and therefore the whole passage, 7:7-25, must be so too. In fact however Nygren makes an exception in the case of vv7-13,<sup>2</sup> which, he claims, are about life before and apart from Christ. We think it necessary (the reasons will appear later) to enlarge the exception to include the whole passage. 7:7-25 is about life apart from the

---

1. op. cit., pp.287ff.

2. ibid. p.277.

redemption in Christ and forms an antithesis to Chapter 8.

We are unable to reconcile what is said in 7:14ff, in terms of the same subject and the same condition of the subject (to use Kümmel's phraseology) with 7:6, or with 6:21-23,<sup>1</sup> or with the blunt statement of 6:14, "you are not under the law", or with 8:1ff (especially 8:2). It is also very significant that there is no reference at all in 7:7-25 to the Spirit, whereas in 8:1-13 the Spirit appears no less than twelve times. Again, the omission of the name of Christ in the main body of the passage, apart from the anticipatory v25a, which is the exception that proves the rule and for which we claim to account satisfactorily in terms of our contention that a dramatisation is before us, is significant over against its occurrence three times in 8:1-3. "Not until we come to ver. 25 is there a single expression used which belongs to Christianity".<sup>2</sup>

What is said positively in the larger context, 5:1-8:39, cannot at the same time be said negatively about the same subject and the same condition of the subject, within the digression constituted by 7:7-25. We must make a distinction between before and after, between life without Christ and life in Christ, between life in the flesh and life in the Spirit. This distinction describes the difference between 7:7ff and 8:1ff.

1. In which ὡς ἔ opposes the ἔ of v21. The aorist participle is also very difficult to reconcile with 7:14 and 7:24.

2. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1902, p.186.

The standpoint from which the passage is written is certainly Christian but it is not the Christian who is portrayed. We thus reject the view associated with Augustine, Luther, Calvin, T. Zahn, K. Barth, F.F. Bruce, J. Murray and others.<sup>1.</sup>

7:7-25 then is not about the present life of the Christian, yet the Christian can use the passage with profit. He can do so in two ways.

Firstly, he can understand the position of man apart from Jesus Christ in the light of this theological analysis. He can in consequence understand better what he himself is, by first understanding what he is not. 7:7ff then presents the dark background against which the bright colours of 7:6, which reappear in 8:1ff having been anticipated in 7:25a, can be truly appreciated.

Secondly and most important, he can understand the threat to his own Christian position. This can only be understood eschatologically. The eschatological event of Jesus Christ establishes the Christian in an eschatological tension.<sup>2.</sup> He belongs at one and the same time to two Ages.

1. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.98, argues that the context and the content together make a reference to the Christian as such impossible; cf. also pp.96-109.

2. For the theological understanding of the eschatological position of the Christian see W. Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament", Eschatology, edd. T.F. Torrance and J.K.S. Reid, 1953, (especially pp.6f, 12-14). The whole article is relevant to our argument as is also that of W.A. Whitehouse, "The Modern Discussion of Eschatology", *ibid.* pp.63-89; likewise C.K. Barrett, "New Testament Eschatology: 1. Jewish and Pauline Eschatology", *S.J.T.*, 6 (1953), 136ff (especially pp.136, 145, 146f). Also cf. R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law", Essays: Philosophical and Theological, 1955, pp.63ff; A.R. Vidler, "Christ's Strange Work", 1963, p.33; K. Kertelge, "Exegetische Überlegungen zum Verständnis der paulinischen Anthropologie nach Römer 7", *Z.N.T.W.*, 62 (1971), pp.112ff; A. Schweitzer, "Paul and his Interpreters", 1912, pp.222 nl, 241; W. Wrede, "Paul", 1907, pp.103, 105f, 111; C.K. Barrett, "From First Adam to Last", 1962, pp.89, 95f, 105;

In the language of Chapter 5 he is "in Christ" and he is also "in Adam". In the language of Chapter 6 he has died to sin but must reckon himself dead to sin and slay the deeds of the body. In the language of Chapter 8 he walks after the Spirit but he may again walk after the flesh.

The prime importance of this eschatological possibility is recognised by many commentators on Romans 7. C.K. Barrett<sup>1</sup> brings out clearly that "the ambiguous personal situation" of the Christian reflects the eschatological situation. "He is, and he is not, free from sin; he lives, and he does not live, for God; he is at the same time a righteous man and a sinner". Although we disagree with Luther's primary exegesis of the passage, his celebrated phrase "simul iustus et peccator"<sup>2</sup> expresses a vital truth. A.M. Hunter,<sup>3</sup> following C.L. Mitton, says that vv14-25

---

(cont'd) G. Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology", 1961, pp.60f; C.A. Anderson Scott, "Christianity According to St. Paul", 1932, p.147; "The first meets us again and again in St. Paul, namely, the paradoxical assertion of an experience which is complete and yet in process, certain and yet conditioned, present and yet an object of aspiration and hope", (cf. pp.134ff where he expresses the same thought in different terms, emphasising salvation as a process). H. Anderson, "The Historical Paul", New College Bulletin, 4 (Spring 1968), 18, speaks of "...that precarious equipoise between 'having' the gospel and 'not having' it". The Church is likewise an eschatological phenomenon to be described by paradox. cf. eg. C.H. Dodd, "History and the Gospel", 1943, pp.150ff.

1. "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.152; cf. pp.129f.

2. On this phrase cf. A. Skevington Wood, "The Theology of Luther's Lectures on Romans", S.J.T., 3 (1950), 122; T.F. Torrance, "The Eschatology of the Reformation", Eschatology, edd. T.F. Torrance and J.K.S. Reid, 1953, pp.41f.

3. "The Epistle to the Romans", p.74.





keen awareness of the point at issue. He maintains that the misery of the unredeemed man, described from the standpoint of the redeemed man, does not mean "that 7:7-25" may not be used for the self-understanding of the Christian". Later<sup>1</sup> he continues, "Certainly one may not say that here one looks back from the secure shore of faith to the storm and the ghosts which have accompanied the believer on his journey to this shore. Evidently one cannot leave behind the experiences of Rom. 7 as a vanquished and surpassed level of development. Rather the past and lostness of the unredeemed remains in a very definite sense present even for the Christian, as one forgiven and conquered. Indeed, the past becomes transparent for him only in faith. He does not have the righteousness of faith in any other way than by offering the sacrifice of his own righteousness. He has acquittal, being 'in Christ', only in the confession of his lostness under law, sin and death .... Thus the self-understanding of the redeemed (Rom. 8) and the self-understanding of the sinner (Rom. 7) are most firmly linked to one another. Therefore the past remains the precipitous foundation of the new being in Christ. In precisely this way it is shown that the righteousness of the believer is the 'aliena iustitia' of Christ and that man in looking to himself is lost".

The solemn and recurring moral and spiritual exhortations in Paul's Epistles are explained by this very eschatological tension. Paul's

---

1. *ibid.* p.101.

eschatology is thus the basis of his paraenesis leading to his frequent indicative-imperative formula.<sup>1</sup> In as far as the Christian steps outside his position in Christ, the description in 7:7ff becomes relevant. We can express the matter differently in terms of boasting.<sup>2</sup> If the object of a Christian's boasting changes from God, or Christ, or the Cross, or tribulation in as far as it serves as the occasion for a manifestation of God's help, to someone or something other than God, then the Christian denies his true position. He departs from the truth, which means that he is seeing the matter as God sees it. But it must be carefully noted that we are then talking about him not in his Christian status but in his lapse from it. Not that he can lapse from it in the true, that is, in the eschatological nature of his existence, but he can act as if it were so. Once more we have the paradox which inevitably confronts us when we try to understand the ambiguity of the Christian existence in the light of the eschatological tension.

It is precisely this ambiguity, eschatologically constituted, which accounts for the element of conflict in the Christian's life. This aspect was indeed a common theme of missionary preaching.<sup>3</sup> There is certainly ample room in Paul's thought for the concept of conflict

1. C.A. Anderson Scott, op. cit., pp.207f, says that Paul is following the "principle of consistency" or conversely that he demonstrates "the irrationality of conduct which contradicts the Christian experience". When applied to Christian morality this involves the formula, if you are this .... you cannot be that.

2. cf. R. Bultmann, "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961, pp.129, 133, 136f, 145.

3. cf. G.B. Caird, "The Apostolic Age", 1955, p.111 and his references. He instances 1 Pet. 2:11; Jas. 4:1; Rom. 7:23. No literary dependence can be shown between these but each is developing a common theme in his own way.

in the Christian, witness his images - the race, the contest, the battle, the war, the boxer, the wrestler; his sustained figure in Eph. 6:10ff; his personal experiences of enemies without and fears within; the reference in Rom. 8:23; Phil. 4:12 (N.E.B.); 1 Cor. 9:27; and of course there is the tradition of Jesus and his conflicts and there is reason to think that Paul was by no means ignorant of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> This conflict however,

#### 1. Concerning Paul's knowledge of Jesus:-

1. On W.C. van Unnik's thesis based on Ac. 22:3, Paul may well have had some acquaintance with Jesus prior to the Resurrection. (See "Tarsus or Jerusalem?: The City of Paul's Youth", 1962, where he works out at length a view previously suggested, cf. his references p.111, that Paul was taken to Jerusalem in early childhood. H. Anderson, op. cit., p.11, asks "Is there any good reason why Luke should have invented these details ((i.e. Ac. 22:3)) about Paul's early contacts with Jerusalem?"). Even apart from van Unnik, if the time lapse between the crucifixion and the death of Stephen was short, then Paul may well have seen Jesus in the flesh. (cf. J. Weiss, "The History of Primitive Christianity", 1, 1937, p.188.). W. Wrede, op. cit., p.147 and R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.114, deny that Paul had seen Jesus. W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.873, para. 763b seems to leave it open.

2. We do not think that 2 Cor. 5:16 refers to a personal acquaintance of Paul with Jesus before the encounter on the way to Damascus. On 2 Cor. 5:16 cf. J.W. Fraser, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: 11 Corinthians V.16 Once More", N.T.S., 17 (1971), 293-313; V.P. Furnish, "The Jesus-Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann", B.J.R.L., 47 (1965), 355 and n3; J. Knox, "Chapters in a Life of Paul", 1950, p.123; J.S. Stewart, "A Man in Christ", 1935, pp.279ff.)

3. We regard it as certain that Paul possessed an extensive knowledge of Jesus and of his sayings. (cf. A. Schweitzer, "Paul and his Interpreters", 1912, pp.245f; A.M. Hunter, "Paul and his Predecessors", 1961, pp.45ff, 108f; A. Sabatier, "The Apostle Paul", 1891, pp.76-85; J. Weiss, op. cit., 1 p.187; C.H. Dodd, "History and the Gospel", 1943, pp.63ff; C.A. Anderson Scott, op. cit., pp.11ff, 215; G.B. Caird, op. cit., p.108; J.S. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 18ff, 282ff; W.D. Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, p.195f; J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology", Expository Times, 76 (1964-5), p.30. We do not think it possible to maintain as many expositors do (eg. A.M. Hunter, "Interpreting the New Testament", 1951, p.73) that few if any of Jesus's interpreters saw more deeply into the secret of what he was and did than Paul, without assuming a great deal of knowledge about Jesus on Paul's part.

4. Paul's admitted silence in providing direct information regarding the earthly life of Jesus can be explained in various ways.

a. The silence covers his shame that the Messiah was present and he had not known it. D. Cox, "Jung and St. Paul", 1959, pp.38f, explains

and this must be emphasised, is not the same in kind as the conflict or split which is portrayed in 7:7ff. In other words Gal. 5:16-18 is not a parallel to Rom. 7:7ff.<sup>1</sup> In Galatians there is no note of despair to match 7:24; nor is it the vous which wars against the flesh but the Spirit from his superior position; and there is no question of the Christian in Gal. 5:16ff being "sold under sin" and "prisoner of war", on the contrary he is "under" the Spirit and this is liberty.<sup>2</sup>

(cont'd) Paul's lack of "awareness" of Jesus by the psychological mechanism of repression.

b. Most, if not all, of Paul's Epistles are about specific circumstances, therefore both space and purpose are limited. The remarkable fact is rather that in such small compass such rich content and such extensive reference is to be found.

c. Paul distinguished himself from the Apostles who had been with Jesus. He knew Jesus too but not in the same sense. (cf. J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, pp.314, 435.)

d. The Churches to which Paul wrote were already informed about Jesus. The Epistles are supplements to what they already knew. (cf. A.M. Hunter, "Introducing New Testament Theology", 1957, pp.103f.)

e. Paul was supremely interested in the Cross and Resurrection in which the whole life of Jesus and the whole Gospel are summed up, as also in a continuing relationship with Christ through the Spirit. This personal factor is reflected in the emphases of his Epistles.

f. A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p.245, regards the conditions in the era after the Cross and Resurrection as so radically different from the preceding one, information about Jesus in the flesh is no longer relevant. (cf. R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.124.)

g. It should not be overlooked that in 1 Pet. and 1 Jn. and Ac. and Rev. there are very few explicit references to the earthly life of Jesus, but we cannot infer thereby that the writers knew little or cared less. (cf. L. Levison, "Life of St. Paul", pp.40f.)

5. To sum up, we think it probable but not certain, that Paul could have some acquaintance with Jesus in the flesh; we are sure that he had extensive knowledge of Jesus and his sayings, indeed far more than we now possess; and we regard the absence of explicit and concentrated reference to the earthly life of Jesus as fully capable of explanation.

1. As A.D. Nock, "St. Paul", 1938, p.166 seems to think.

2. cf. S. Toussaint, "The Contrast between the Spiritual Conflict in Romans 7 and Galatians 5", Bibliotheca Sacra, 123 (1966), 310-314.



We may seem to come close to saying that the passage is about the Christian as well as the man who is under the law and apart from Christ but this is not so. The very possibility of gaining such an impression is significant of the essential problem confronting us. The matter must be understood with extreme care, the point on which the issue turns is such a fine one. Only when the Christian is not acting in terms of his new, God-given nature are we able to apply the passage to him. It is then about the Christian when he is not being a Christian. If this seems contradictory then so be it, because this is how it is.<sup>1.</sup> We have here, we stress once more, a paradox eschatologically derived. The necessity for such a way of thinking belongs to the nature of the Christian existence. If we are pressed to identify the origin of the paradox beyond an analysis of the historical development of eschatology such as H.J. Schoeps,<sup>2.</sup> among others, gives, then we can only say that it belongs to the ultimate difference between ourselves and God.<sup>3.</sup>

1. cf. W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.159: "St. Paul presents the case from the standpoint of Christianity, but a Christianity not present in all its terms. We are contemplating an abstraction developed by dialectic, not the actual situation either of the regenerate or of the unregenerate man, but only the hypothetical condition of a Christian under Law, a Contradictio in Adjecto".

2. "Paul", 1961, pp.88ff.

3. In particular cf. W.A. Whitehouse, "The Modern Discussion<sup>f</sup> Eschatology", in Eschatology, edd. T.F. Torrance and J.K.S. Reid, 1953, pp.82f. G.B. Caird, op. cit., p.137, writes, "Some of the difficulties of Paul's thought are paradoxes of the sort that delighted the Semitic mind. Like a true Hebrew Paul was never afraid to hold in tension two ideas which he made no attempt to reconcile"; and *ibid.* p.192, "We must therefore reckon with (he is commenting on apparent inconsistencies in the eschatology of 1 and 2 Thess. and Mk. 13) the possibility that the Jew was able to take in his stride paradoxes which have perplexed Gentiles ancient and modern. Where we should make a guarded statement, the Semitic mind prefers to throw together two extreme statements and allow the one to qualify the other". cf. also A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.239.



The eschatological situation then is the all-important factor in assessing the relevance of 7:7ff to the Christian. We submit that a failure to recognise the eschatological situation, or an error in relating or apportioning or balancing the opposed elements (either existentially in connecting the old status with the new, or logically in terms of the eschatological opposites held in tension) leads to the false ascription of 7:7-25 "simpliciter" to the Christian. But there is in fact no "simplex status". There is rather an eschatological, bi-polar tension to one pole of which alone we may refer 7:7-25. If we overstress one of the opposites in the eschatological tension or in other words, if we fail to adhere rigorously to the logic of the paradox, then the text itself will confound us. We mean by "the logic of the paradox" that if a paradox is the assertion of two postulates which appear to contradict each other, yet both are necessary to account for all the facts, then the logic or theoretical structure of the paradox requires that we maintain each postulate in balance. If we work with one side only we are sure to err. Each statement is necessary to explain and balance and correct the other. Understanding comes therefore when we follow whither each side of the paradox leads, not when we have succeeded in dissolving the contradiction. It is a case of parallel lines which never meet rather than converging lines which intersect. The ensuing intellectual tension reflects the eschatological tension and must be accepted as the condition both of our Christian existence and our Christian understanding. In a word the ontology requires an eschatology. In addition, although of secondary importance to the exegetical necessities, our interpretation will not fit the facts of Christian experience if we handle the opposites wrongly.

K. Barth<sup>1.</sup> says that the dead past from which the Christian may be delivered may still be his existence. "It may still be there for God's eyes and my own". In his earlier Commentary he makes the observation,<sup>2.</sup> "Paul describes his past, present, and future existence. He portrays a situation as real after the episode on the road to Damascus as before it". We suggest that Barth does not distinguish precisely enough between the opposite sides of the paradox. What is said about the one side must be held apart from what is said about the other. If we can maintain the paradox successfully we may then affirm that the passage is not about the Christian but that the Christian can use it with profit. The word "but" in the last sentence reflects the basic paradox. If on the other hand, we fail to do so then we have to say that the passage is about the Christian. We are then in the pre-Kummel viewpoint and take up position alongside Augustine, Luther, Nygren and the rest.

J.A. Bengel's Commentary on Romans is of special interest from the eschatological point of view. He affirms that in 7:7ff Paul is announcing a general truth and thus Bengel stands in the pre-Augustinian tradition and in a sense anticipates Kummel. But he goes on to say that Paul also means himself and thus he connects as well with the tradition represented by Augustine and Luther and their successors who detect a personal reference by Paul. Bengel understands a personal reference to Paul because he understands the passage to deal with a "processus" from

---

1. "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1956, p.79.

2. "The Epistle to the Romans", 1933, p.270.

law to grace, not with a "simple status". It is about "becoming" rather than about "being". The resemblance of this view to that which emphasises the eschatological tension and seeks to balance the opposite poles of the tension will be obvious.

We may be tempted to think that the dividing line between the two interpretations - the Christian and the non-Christian - is very thin, whereas in fact there is a yawning chasm if one that may not always be easily recognised. Like an inverted triangle which starts from a point and expands in area the further it moves from that point, so do the two views remove from one another. We find the crux to lie in the eschatological tension. G. Bornkamm shows an acute awareness of where the nerve of the matter lies when he raises the question about Bultmann's "backward look".<sup>1</sup> Bornkamm says, "Nevertheless, it appears to me that the question is not yet sufficiently clarified about what the 'backward look' of Rom. 7:7ff to the unredeemed being of man means".<sup>2</sup>

The possibility of assessing the tension in a variety of ways means that we can expect to find more than one interpretation and this is in fact what happens. The possibility is always there and so the classic variations on the theme are constructed and repeated over the generations.<sup>3</sup>

1. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, 1952, p.247: "The perversion of human striving that pursues life and yet only garners death is described at length in Rom. 7:7-25, a passage in which Paul so depicts the situation of man under the Torah as it becomes clear to a backward look from the standpoint of Christian faith". <sup>has</sup>

2. op. cit., p.101.

3. Examples of recent writers who recognise the eschatological tension clearly but identify the εἶδος with the Christian are: J.I. Packer, "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7", *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 87, 1964, p.626; J.R.W. Stott, "Men made new", 1966, pp.72ff; J. Philip, "Christian Maturity", 1964, pp.34ff. W.G. Kümmel, "Man in the New Testament", 1963, p.52 n60, lists recent works interpreting 7:7ff of the Christian.

P. Denham says,<sup>1.</sup> "The traumatic condition which it has been desired to see in Rom. 7 and which has been linked with the painful failure of Paul in the observance of the law, is now relegated to the museum of exegetical absurdities". This is strong language with a loud emotional overtone. We should be careful in applying it to the entire view which relates the passage to the Christian. The fine point on which one's interpretation turns bids us speak with caution and the learned representatives of the contrary view compel our respect if not our agreement. S. Lyonnet<sup>2.</sup> goes beyond what the facts permit when he says that a Christian reference is practically abandoned by all exegetes today. The position is in fact more complex. U. Luz<sup>3.</sup> also <sup>writes</sup> too confidently in similar strain. We would like to think that it were so, but a survey of the literature shows that it is not. The problem is such and the all-important eschatological tension is so finely balanced, we can see no end to the debate.

We offer as a guiding principle in assessing any interpretation of 7:7-25 that one should discover how the eschatological tension is dealt with. This will give the key to the direction of the interpretation. When Alexander Whyte received a work on Romans from his bookseller, he would turn to Chapter 7 and buy the book or not according to what he found there.<sup>4.</sup> We say - evaluate an interpretation of 7:7ff by the way it handles the eschatological factor.

1. "Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance", 1953, p.229, quoted F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.181 nl.

2. "L'Histoire du Salut selon le Chapitre VII de l'Épître aux Romains", Biblica, 43 (1962), 118.

3. "Das Gesichtsverständnis des Paulus", 1968, pp.60f.

4. cf. F.F. Bruce, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans", 1963, p.151; G.F. Barbour, "The Life of Alexander Whyte, D.D.", 1925, p.305 nl. A. Whyte, "The Apostle Paul", 1903, p.127.

C.L. Mitton<sup>1</sup>. recognises the importance of eschatology in understanding 7:7ff, which thus refers to the past of the Christian and to the present only in as far as the past becomes present for him. Yet (significant word) in a sense it cannot do this. What Christ and the Spirit have done cannot be blotted out and God becomes a liar. Here is the paradox which is dictated by the logic of the eschatological situation.

We have found E. Ellwein's article<sup>2</sup> of particular interest in the allowance he makes for this tension. He begins with an analysis of 7:7-25 and proceeds to a statement and criticism of the classic interpretations both ancient and modern. He focuses attention on Bengel,<sup>3</sup> to whom we have already referred, and his emphasis on the "processus" from law to grace. This movement in the Christian is ever renewed in answer to the word of the Gospel with its "superior" power. Ellwein speaks of the past which strives to become present again in the Christian, always and on all sides challenging, tormenting and overwhelming him anew.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the salvation-present is a present time of such a kind that it vanishes again and again and we can only confess our

1. In particular see his third article, "Romans vii Reconsidered", Expository Times, 65 (1953-4), 132ff.

2. "Das Rätsel von Römer VII", Kerugma und Dogma, 1, (1955), 247ff.

3. *ibid.* pp.260ff and 266ff.

4. We are interested to note Ellwein's recourse to personification in his interpretation of Romans 7:7ff which we regard as a step on the road to the recognition of a dramatic portrayal.

poverty. This existential movement of faith, ever and again passing backward and forward from new to old, thus requires a logic of its own. "The gift of freedom from sin and law is an eschatological 'datum' which must ever anew become a 'dandum'. We possess it only in that it is given us ever anew. It remains the vertical which from time to time breaks through the horizontal of our natural and pious life in an absolutely miraculous fashion."<sup>1</sup> Thus the assurance of faith can only be the personal encouragement which the Word gives us; thus the "mors mystica" or experience of utter despair may visit the Christian again and again; thus the "processus" continues until the heavenly vision of the glory of God when man becomes a πνευματικὸν ἄνθρωπον, and the tension between the two Ages is resolved and faith becomes sight.<sup>2</sup>

1. op. cit., p.267, our translation.

2. Ellwein's concluding remarks, pp.266-268, are worth close study. We think that he blunders in quoting (p.268) with approval from O. Michel, "Gott muss den Menschen in den Abgrund der Selbsterkenntnis führen, um ihm die Bedeutung des Evangeliums klarzumachen .... Auch der Christ wird durch die Botschaft in die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Geist und Fleisch hineingestellt (Gal. 5, 16-18), ja er muss durch die Tiefe der Gesetzerkenntnis und der Selbsterkenntnis hindurchgehen, um das Evangelium in seiner ganzen Grösse zu verstehen .... Die durch Jesus Christus uns geschenkte Gnade geht immer durch das Bekenntnis von Rom, 7, 7-25 hindurch, nie an ihm vorbei". This is an echo of Luther's "Second Use of the Law". Against this cf. K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", H.T.R., 56 (1963), 206ff. We also reject Ellwein's assertion of the relevance of Gal. 5:16-18 as a direct parallel to Rom. 7:7ff, see rather G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp.100f; P. Althaus, "Paulus und Luther über den Menschen", 1963, pp.114-118 (especially pp.117f); C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.102.



When we recognise the importance of the eschatological situation of the Christian, we are then able and only then, to make correct practical use of 7:7ff. If we employ the passage in private devotion, in public worship, in preaching and teaching, we must always remember that it is not about the Christian. Only when we speak of the negative pole of the eschatological opposites which comprise the Christian's condition can we relate the passage to the Christian and then only paradoxically. If we use it in private devotion - perhaps as a prayer of confession, or if we employ it in public worship - perhaps in a fashion similar to the General Confession in the Book of Common Prayer, we must appreciate that we are abstracting it from its context in the Epistle. In homiletics we can make two possible uses. The first is that of the purist who has strict regard to the text and context. In the second case, knowingly or unknowingly, we step outside the context and make whatever use serves our purpose of the moment. We should discriminate carefully between the use dictated by exegesis and that directed by expediency and avoid the latter resolutely.

We have been interested to discover that very few writers<sup>1.</sup> do in fact attempt to relate 7:7-25 to personal devotion and to public worship. We submit that this fact supports our contention that the passage comprises a theological analysis and not a Christian confession.

---

1. E. Ellwein op. cit., p.264, stresses the direct involvement of the subject matter of the passage with proclamation and with pastoral work. C.L. Mitton, in whom we think echoes of John Wesley's doctrine of perfect love are audible, recognises that the issue is not merely of literary interest but concerns the heights to which a Christian may aspire. See also J. Blank, op. cit., p.20.

The exceptions tend to be, apart from the works to which reference has been made, volumes of a "devotional" nature rather than <sup>of</sup> a scholarly nature. It may also not be without interest to remark that during the early stages of work on this Thesis, when we were ranging through the Pauline Epistles and probing into the Epistle to the Romans, texts and themes tumbled about us from every side for personal benefit and for pulpit use. As soon as we narrowed our interest to the passage under review the flow dried up and we have in fact made very little homiletical use of the passage. The general view which one holds of the passage one way or the other will dictate the practical use which one allows. It is possible of course to divorce theory and practice and so make a practical use which does not accord with the theological understanding, but this is a procedure hardly to be commended.

We end this section with a reference to the acute and salutary observation of E. Ellwein<sup>1</sup> offered in the course of an account and evaluation of H. Asmussen who stands in the Augustine-Luther-Nygren tradition. Ellwein asks if it is such a certain fact that our Christianity which finds its own experience in this Chapter corresponds to the Christianity of Paul and the primitive Church. Would it not be an alarming situation indeed, he continues, if we were to recognise our own Christian condition in Paul's description of the unredeemed, non-Christian sighing under the law, a situation moreover which is not discernible to the Jew himself?

---

1. op. cit., p.266.

c. <sup>7 \</sup>The  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  and Paul.

Much of what has been said about the passage and its relation to the present life of the Christian is relevant also to the question of the relation of the passage to Paul himself and need not be repeated. We have not found a direct reference to the Christian nor do we find a direct reference to the Christian Apostle. In addition we will find reason, now and later in the course of exegesis, to reject an explicit reference in the passage to Paul's pre-Christian experience. We are in substantial agreement with W. Manson<sup>1</sup> that "we ought to give up the idea of writing a pre-baptismal biography of the great apostle. If we still attempt it, we should be sparing in our use of the supposed evidence supplied by Rom vii". Our conclusion is then that 7:7-25 is not in any direct sense about Paul.

We have on the other hand to assert that Paul is not completely unrelated to the matter under discussion and this is so in two senses. Firstly, we claim that the passage is presented in a dramatic form. The "I" in the drama is not Paul himself. He stands over against the "I" as its creator, as the author or dramatist is separated from the characters in his play. He contrives the device but is not to be identified with it. We must however make a qualification. Something of Paul does certainly carry over into the presentation. No one can write or speak except out

---

1. "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.159.

of what he knows.<sup>1.</sup> What we find in a subject depends to some degree on what we bring to it. In 7:7-25 the emotional characteristics, the vigorous language, the emphasis on felt hostility and constraint all reflect the stuff of which Paul's own life was made. C.K. Barrett<sup>2.</sup> understands this indirect connection well. He writes, "In answering these questions Paul is incidentally involved in an analysis of human nature. It is true that the analysis is not merely academic; Paul wrote what he smartingly did feel. But it is human nature, and not Paul's nature, with which he deals; and it is human nature on earth, and not in heaven, that he describes."

E. Ellwein<sup>3.</sup> allows some place for a confessional element in the passage. Against R. Bultmann he writes, "In fact is not the word order much too strong, much too personal, much too subjective for it not be recognised in its rightly understood 'confessional' character, over against all attempts to pass lightly over this personal character?"<sup>a</sup> We have gained the impression that Ellwein is so eager to benefit from all the classic interpretations that his eclecticism leads to an element

1. A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.69: "...we all tend to universalise what life has done to us ...."

2. "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.152, in which the questions to which reference is made comprise the connection of law and religion with sin and death. cf. P. Bläser, op. cit., p.116.

3. op. cit., p.260 (our translation). T. Zahn and J.C.K. von Hofman of course support the confessional view wholeheartedly as do all who follow the autobiographical interpretation.

of confusion. We affirm that an appreciation of the dramatic form of presentation enables us to make full allowance for the element which Ellwein commends as pointing to a confessional character. The dramatic form is admirably suited for the task of objective writing in which colouring is imported from experience but without departing from the objective point of view. Paul can give a theological analysis and yet at the same time maintain a remote connection with it. He is a man writing about man but not about himself though he too is man. The presentation is objective and not subjective. We agree with W.G. Kümmel's conclusion that the passage is not autobiographical<sup>1</sup> and that the "I" is not Paul.<sup>2</sup>

In the second place we have found a salvation history reference in the passage. Paul himself stands within that saving history and is part of it. We reject however the view of J. Munck,<sup>3</sup> which we regard as a highly exaggerated estimate of Paul's role in the events in the "eschaton" of the saving history. Munck has done notable service in his reappraisal of the Tübingen position and in his emphasis on the eschatological nature of Paul's mission and message. There is a tendency in his thought to push valid theses too far until the insight which they contain is blunted

1. *op. cit.*, p.12.

2. *ibid*, pp.98, 117. cf. R.N. Longenecker, *op. cit.*, p.96: "....I do not believe any of Romans 7 to be strictly biographical".

3. In particular in his magnum opus, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959; also against E. Stauffer, *T.D.N.T.*, 2, p.362.

by exaggeration. We agree that Paul rejoiced in his call as the chosen Apostle of the Gentiles and that he occupied a very important role in the Gentile mission, Munck's exaggerated emphasis on awareness of himself however makes us suspect a pathological state of mind in Paul, indeed a "second Messiah" complex. Munck is reacting too strongly to the Hegelian basis of the Tübingen outlook and to psychological interpretations of Paul. In the former case we can imagine Hegel smiling and saying with glee, "I told you so! antithesis always follows thesis". In the latter a reaction to psychological interpretations has resulted in overdrawn psychological conclusions.

The picture we gain of Paul from Munck does not square with Paul's relation to his fellow Christians as that appears in his Epistles. They too belonged to the salvation history and the responsibility for the world mission was on the shoulders of all. The idea also that the Gentile delegates at the delivery of the collection would trigger a jealousy mechanism in the unbelieving Jews and bring in the End, is an oversimplification. Paul himself at the time of writing Romans looked beyond Jerusalem to Rome and a mission in the West. The theory of a subsequent substitution of proclamation before the Emperor in which the latter would represent the Gentiles, allowing fulfilment of Paul's East-West mission and thus bringing in the End "second time round", is also too naive. When Paul wrote Romans the duration of his stay in Rome was to be short, measured by his intention to press on to Spain and the West. The recasting of his expectations following his arrest, which Munck suggests, is made on very insubstantial foundations. Acts certainly



gives no such indications. In fact we think the new construction can only be made on the very ground which Munck is abandoning, namely, a psychological interpretation of Paul, in this instance by understanding a displacement ~~in~~ Paul's mind whereby the one frustrated expectation (Gentiles to Jerusalem - Jews jealous - the End) is succeeded by another hope (Rome - the Emperor as representative of the Gentiles - the End). Paul is too complex a character to be explained along this one line. When we do so explain him we lose sight of other important factors: his recognition of what is now known as "realised" or "inaugurated" eschatology;<sup>1</sup> his emphasis on justification and other salvation terms; his strategic geographical sense; his adaptability in meeting changing and complex circumstances; the very complex nature of the primitive Church to which he was so heavily indebted and its importance in Paul's conversion and mission; his dependence on guidance by the Spirit; his decreasing interest in an early Parousia. W.D. Davies<sup>2</sup> sums up the matter very well: "....while all Paul's life and thought is eschatological, eschatology is not the whole of Paul".

---

1. cf. G. Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology", 1961, p.39 who speaks of "incipient realisation".

2. "Review of 'Paulus und Die Heilsgeschichte'", N.T.S., 2 (1955-56), 72. The whole article, pp.60-73, is a balanced appreciation and criticism of Munck. A fuller appreciation appears in W.D. Davies, "Christian Origins and Judaism", 1962, Chapter 8, pp.179-198. See also the same writer's article, "The Apostolic Age and the Life of Paul", in Peake 1962, p.877, para. 767 a. and b. Also cf. H. Anderson, "The Historical Paul", New College Bulletin, 4 (Spring 1968), 15ff.

When Paul writes he cannot become what he is not and step outside his Christian position. 7:7-25 is written by the man who is both Christian and Apostle. The insights are essentially those of the man in Christ.<sup>1</sup> These insights however can be shared by the other man who is under the law, whose situation Paul seeks to clarify. It is in this sense that W. Manson<sup>2</sup> describes the controlling interest of the passage as, "What is life under the law according to the logic of its nature?" Paul is able to do this because the law itself has a revelatory function. The opening verse of the passage reads, "I did not know ..... except the law ....", on which F.J. Leenhardt comments,<sup>3</sup> "The law does not merely indicate the temporary nature of its role; it says precisely what this role is". Leenhardt continues,<sup>4</sup> "Its (the law's) true function is to enlighten man as to what he is and the nature of what he does". If we do not allow that the law has this ability to give such insight (in its own degree which is not equal to that of the Gospel) then we cut the nerve which joins the Old Covenant and the New, the Old Testament and the New, the νόμος and the εὐαγγέλιον. The common nerve is the self-revelation of the gracious God who is the source alike of the law and of the Gospel.

---

1. cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.152; "The insights of this paragraph are Christian insights". The paragraph in question is 7:7-25.

2. "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.159.

3. op. cit., p.180.

4. ibid. p.185.

So Paul seeks to elucidate what the law declares man's position to be. But Paul has the advantage. He knows the end from the beginning. He looks inside from outside. He writes from a superior position. He indicates as much by the sudden intrusion of the Fourth Scene (v25a) and then in 8:1ff, in full explanation, he swings to the polar opposite of 7:7-24. In as far as Paul is "in Adam", in as far as he belongs to the Age that is past, the "I" may be said to have a relation to Paul. Thus we return to the all-important eschatological tension. An eschatological fulcrum appears. We find ourselves saying, "in as far as", or "to some extent", or "on the other hand", or we add the inevitable "but".

The "I" relates to Paul in as far as he is in "Adam", but then he is not "in Adam", he is "in Christ", yet in a sense he is both. There is a point of balance beyond which we fall to the one side or to the other. So we are forced to say that Paul himself is connected with 7:7-25 only by an eschatological abstraction.<sup>1</sup> In other words the pattern already discovered when we studied the relation of 7:7ff to the Christian reappears.

This heavily qualified connection between Paul and the subject matter of the passage is confirmed when we come to the positive side of the presentation of which 7:7ff is the negative. There is a total

---

1. cf. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.96: "It is not just Paul, nor is it just humanity. Both these positions have hold of aspects of the truth, yet both fall short in representing Paul's meaning. It is both Paul and humanity, but only, as and, because it is humanity in Adam". cf. Gal. 2:20 where Paul lives EV ΕΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ but at the same time EV ΠΙΣΤΕΙ followed by the objective genitive.

disconnection between 7:25a, 8:1ff and 7:7-24, 25b which is expressed both in terms of the literary form, in that a change of scene takes place, and also in theological content, in that the theme of 7:7ff contrasts with the theme of 8:1ff. Paul stands on the positive side. He can be located on the negative side only in the sense of an eschatological possibility which is expressed paradoxically. In 8:1-4 the form of presentation changes. ἐξ appears in 8:2 and ἐν ἡμῖν in 8:4.<sup>1</sup> The dramatic form is abandoned. 7:6 is resumed. Paul now speaks of himself as he did not and could not in 7:7ff. Paul is to be identified with the content of 8:1ff as he is not to be identified with the content of 7:7ff.

It remains now to examine the relationship between 7:7ff and the experience of Paul commonly although inadequately known as his conversion.<sup>2</sup> While priority must be given to the Epistles as sources of information,<sup>3</sup> there is substantial agreement between these and the accounts in Acts,<sup>4</sup> in particular between Gal. 1 and Acts. While there

1. In W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.125, we assume that ἡμῖν should read ἡμῶν.

2. Direct reference to this event is found in Paul's Epistles in Gal. 1: 11-16; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:3-11; Phil. 3:12. Probable indirect reference is found in 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 3:3; Rom.1:1; and possible reference in 1 Cor. 9:16; Phil. 3:4-7. The relevant passages in Acts are 9:1-19; 22:1-16; 26:1-18.

3. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.143; G.J. Inglis, "St. Paul's Conversion in his Epistles", Theology, 34 (1937), 215; T.W. Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians", B.J.R.L., 24 (April 1940), 1.

4. cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", pp.13, 24, 29; J. Knox, op. cit., p.115.

are differences in detail within the three narratives in Acts, according to the standpoint of the speaker vis-a-vis the listeners, the accounts agree regarding the essential features of the event. This happening which is there related and interpreted should be distinguished from the visions and revelations of Paul (for instance 2 Cor. 12:1ff) which are different in kind.<sup>1.</sup>

It is generally agreed that the event was the great turning-point in Paul's life.<sup>2.</sup> We affirm with J.D.G. Dunn<sup>3.</sup> that "Paul's three-day experience was a unity" and that all the elements in it must be taken into account. Further, Paul's conversion and his vocation as Apostle are not to be separated but belong to the one event.<sup>4.</sup> The connection between his conversion and his doctrine is also very close, although we are certainly dealing with more than a change in beliefs.

1. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.148; A. Sabatier, op. cit., pp.65ff; A.E. Garvie, "Studies in the Pauline Theology", The Expositor, 7th Series, 7, (1909), 30; J. Knox, op. cit., pp.121f; W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.873, para. 763c. cf. also J. Munck, op. cit., p.35.

2. R.P. Shedd, "Man in Community", 1958, p.93, says vigorously that apart from the conversion experience, "Saul of Tarsus might have been another of the illustrious Rabbis of his day".

3. "Baptism in the Holy Spirit", 1970, pp.74ff.

4. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., pp.143, 147f; G.J. Inglis, op. cit., p.225; A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.69; J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology", Expository Times, 76 (1964-5), 29; W.D. Davies, "Peake 1962", p.873, para. 763c.

J. Jeremias<sup>1</sup> catalogues what he considers to be the main doctrinal consequences, yet without losing sight of other factors contributing to his doctrine.<sup>2</sup>

We have to hold together two apparently contradictory assertions concerning Paul's conversion. First, it was an act of God,<sup>3</sup> out of God's sovereign and gracious purpose, sudden, over-whelming, the watershed of Paul's life. J.D.G. Dunn's metaphor<sup>4</sup> expresses well the violence of the experience: "The Damascus road experience was not simply like rounding a sharp corner, but rather like running into a solid object while in full flight". Secondly however, we have to maintain a connection between the event and the past.<sup>5</sup> The God of Israel (that is, of the

1. op. cit., pp.28ff.

2. P.H. Menoud, "Revelation and Tradition", Interpretation, 7 (1953), 131ff, defines it as a "theological conversion" over against that of Augustine or Luther. cf. A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.277; A.S. Peake, "The Quintessence of Paulinism", B.J.R.L., 4 (1917-1918), p.299; R.P. Shedd, op. cit., p.93. But see also C.H. Dodd, "According to the Scriptures", 1952, p.134, who claims that Paul bases his theology on the kerugma as illumined by the prophecies of the Old Testament; also A.M. Hunter, "Paul and his Predecessors", 1961, p.9 et passim on the contribution of the primitive Church.

3. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., pp.159f.

4. op. cit., p.76. cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.11: ".....stopped short by a revelation".

5. cf. P.H. Menoud, op. cit., pp.131, 135; G.J. Inglis, op. cit., p.224; A.S. Peake, op. cit., p.298; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kummel), op. cit., p.46; G.B. Caird, op. cit., pp.122f; C.T. Craig, "The Conversion of Paul", Contemporary Thinking about Paul : An Anthology, 1950, (reprinted from "The Beginning of Christianity", 1943), p.136. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.158 speaks of Paul turning from the Jewish worship of God to the Christian worship of the same God.



covenant past) who separated Paul from his mother's womb (that is, the personal past - Gal.1:15f) was the initiator. Paul's own experience is thus a microcosm corresponding to the macrocosm. A familiar pattern appears. As the Gospel was new but not new (Rom.1:1ff); as the Church belonged to a new order yet was in strict continuity with Israel and with the remnant; as the law was both abolished and yet established; so the creative event in Paul's life was not disconnected from the past. We find therefore in Paul, recourse to Jeremiah and Isaiah for interpretative categories for his experience,<sup>1</sup> a profound respect for his Jewish past, and a desperate attempt to embrace the Gentiles without relinquishing the Jews.

This connection with the past does not allow us however to adopt a reading of the relevant passages which understands a predisposing, psychological preparation in Paul for his conversion experience. J.G. McKenzie<sup>2</sup> provides a good modern statement of this position. He employs the technical terms of analytical psychology - repression, over-compensation, projection, the organic language of the unconscious - to account for the phenomena of the experience and enable a reconstruction of the psychological process by means of which Paul became a Christian. It is, we believe, one of the virtues of W.G. Kummel's study that he turns away from such an interpretation.

---

1. cf. J. Munck, op. cit., pp.29f; A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.65; Isaiah 42:6-7; 49:1-6; and Jeremiah 1:4ff are of special importance but the same texts are not used in all the sources.

2. "Psychology, Psychotherapy, and Evangelicalism", 1940, pp.99ff. cf. C.J. Jung, "Contributions to Analytical Psychology", 1945, pp.257f; E. White, "Saint Paul: the Man and his Mind", 1958, pp.22ff.

Kummel begins by reviewing critically the theories of F.C. Baur and C. Holsten<sup>1</sup> who maintain that the conversion must be understood as an interior psychological event which presents us with the task of unravelling the psychological process along rationalistic lines. Then he considers the position which claims to find specific preparation for Paul's conversion in a state of moral bankruptcy, as this is thought to be illustrated in Rom. 7:7ff.<sup>2</sup> He then goes on to examine first, passages in the Epistles<sup>3</sup> of a biographical interest, all of which are connected with a defence of his apostleship<sup>4</sup> and only then the narratives in Acts.<sup>5</sup>

In Gal. 1:12-17 Paul argues his independence of mind in the days of his Jewish past (vv13f) and then in his first Christian days (vv15-17).<sup>6</sup> The source of his Gospel lies in the revelation of Jesus Christ made to

1. cf. A. Sabatier's criticism of these two writers, op. cit., pp.62ff; and C.S.C. William's criticism of Jung's view: "Jung's thesis is illuminating but quite incapable of proof, and his whole treatment of the subject eliminates the supernatural", "A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles", 1957, p.123.

2. W.G. Kummel lists authorities who relate Rom. 7 and the conversion, op. cit., p.141 n2; and others who reject such a connection, p.142 n4.

3. These are: Gal. 1:12-17; 1 Cor. 15:8; 9:1; 2Cor. 4:6; Phil. 3:5-8.

4. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., pp.143ff.

5. *ibid.* pp.148ff.

6. There is no real contradiction between Gal. 1:12 and Ac.9:10ff. cf. J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.30 and see also Munck's rejection ("Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.16ff) of K. Lake's three sources hypothesis for the Acts narratives. On the absence of Ananias from Ac. 26, cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.151.

him by God.<sup>1</sup> There is no mention of any interior preparation of a psychological nature.<sup>2</sup> In 1 Cor. 15:8, as also in 9:1, a single, definite sight of the Risen Lord ends Paul's hostility to the Christians. In Phil. 3:4ff ὁφθαλμοὶ (v7) is taken as an aorist,<sup>3</sup> pointing to a definite event, namely, the conversion, the originator of that being inferred from διὰ τὸν Χριστόν. In 2 Cor. 4:6, God as originator is emphasised and this passage may possibly allude to the Damascus experience.

The essential content of these passages is regarded by Kummel as a definite, historically fixed experience<sup>4</sup> in which a "sight"<sup>5</sup> or vision of the Lord was given to Paul with the consequent realisation that the resurrection preaching of the disciples was right and Jesus was the Messiah.<sup>6</sup>

1. ἀποκαλύψαι vv15f, (cf.v12), is the important term in which the transition from Judaism to Christianity is contained. It belongs to the same event as καλέεω, although on the other hand ἀπορίεω and καλέεω are associated grammatically. (E. de W. Burton, "The Epistle to the Galatians", 1920, p.49.) Burton takes ἐν ἐμοί v16, as referring to a subjective revelation; also G.J. Inglis, op. cit., pp.220f.

2. cf. J. Munck, op. cit., p.15.

3. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.147.

4. cf. J. Munck, op. cit., p.34; G.J. Inglis, op. cit., p.228.

5. op. cit., "Sehen", pp.147, 148, 159, 160; "Schau", p.148; "Schauung", p.152; "Erscheinung", p.153.

6. op. cit., p.159: "Jesus ist der Messias, das ist der Inhalt der Erlebnisses".

Kummel then considers the narratives in Acts. He affirms their value as reliable evidence and examines the relationship of the accounts to one another and to the material in the Epistles.<sup>1</sup> He regards Chapter 9 as the main account, presented as it is from the standpoint of Paul himself.<sup>2</sup> The three narratives agree in essentials.<sup>3</sup> They offer however no basis at all for the assumption that the pre-condition of the conversion was moral despair and religious doubt.

Nor does Kummel find that apart from Romans 7 any evidence exists (eg. Ac. 26:14) that Paul was impressed by the behaviour of the Christians and in particular of Stephen and was already on the way to faith in Jesus Christ before the Damascus road encounter.<sup>4</sup> Gal. 1:13f speaks for the contrary, as do also Ac. 9:1, 2; 22:4-5; 26:9-12. Kummel also makes the valid and sometimes overlooked observations that, in the first place,

1. Kummel also recognises that there are elements in the event which are beyond our understanding and so he strikes a cautionary note. (eg. p.151 and especially pp.159ff.) He explains the differences between the accounts (three in number for emphasis - so E. Haenchen, "The Acts of the Apostles", 1971, p.327) by the literary intention of the author in the light of the people being addressed. The narratives are not "minutes of meeting" (p.153). We are dealing with the interpretation of an event which cannot be reproduced in precise words and ideas.

2. C.S.C. Williams, op. cit., p.263 prefers the account in Chapter 26.

3. cf. J. Munck, "The Acts of the Apostles", 1967, pp.82, 243. E. Haenchen, op. cit., is very sceptical about the details in the narratives. He finds general agreement due to a common "community tradition" behind all three accounts (p.328).

4. Kummel describes such constructions<sup>as</sup> "reine Phantasie", op. cit., p.154.

fanaticism is not invariably a defence-mechanism. Neither the narratives and allusions nor the history of religion bear out such a claim.<sup>1</sup> In the second place, conversion considered as a religious phenomenon open to inspection is not always preceded by an experience of moral bankruptcy. The account given in Phil. 3:7 of Paul's pre-Christian attitude makes no suggestion of frustration or despair. The emphasis is rather on sacrifice which is more than counterbalanced by gain. In 1 Cor. 15:9 no preconditions are mentioned. Kummel concludes,<sup>2</sup>

"Und so müssen wir eben feststellen, dass das Damaskuserlebnis aus dem Pharisäer und Christenverfolger den Jünger Christi gemacht hat, ohne dass wir von irgendwelchem Übergang etwas wussten".

We shall meet this issue again in the course of exegesis. We agree with Kummel that Romans 7:7ff is not a picture of Paul's pre-Christian condition and that the passage should not be used in explanation of the conversion as that appears in the Epistles and in Acts.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. op.cit., p.157. cf. A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., p.147; R.N. Longenecker op. cit., pp.101ff.

2. op. cit., p.158; cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.11ff; A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.60.

3. Against a psychological preparation see J. Munck, op. cit., pp.11ff, 15, 20, 22, 24; P.H. Menoud, op. cit., pp.131ff; A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.60; J. Knox, op. cit., p.123; M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kummel), "Paul", 1953, p.52; H. Anderson, op. cit., p.14; C.T. Craig, op. cit., pp.136f, lists "conditioning factors" but rejects any reference to an experience of failure in Rom. 7. E. Haenchen, op. cit., p.328, stresses that Luke's motive in writing is to present Christ as the initiator of the Gentile mission, which makes a psychological explanation of the conversion foreign to his explicit purpose. In favour of a psychological preparation see J. Weiss, op. cit., I, p.190; W. James, "Varieties of Religious Experience", 1902, pp.251,171; S. Cave, "The Gospel of St. Paul", 1928, pp.33f; A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.73; B.W. Robinson, "Influences leading towards the Conversion of Paul", Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag, 1927, ed. K.L. Schmidt, pp.108ff, especially p.113, understands the conversion experience as the product of social elements in Paul's past which fuse together in that moment. C.S.C. Williams, op. cit., p.122 lists antecedents for the conversion of Paul in his past.

d. The Standpoint of the Passage.

Although Paul uses the Genesis allusion to build from the classic drama towards his own dramatic venture, the hinge on which the argument turns is not Adam. Nor is it Moses although Paul cannot use the term νομος without explicit and major reference to the Torah. Nor is it Paul himself. The hinge on which the argument turns is Jesus Christ. This is another way of saying that the passage is written from a Christian standpoint. The Christian has an acute insight peculiar to himself in that he sees the salvation history and the situation to which it answers in the light of Jesus Christ alone. Paul has learned to make a Christological critique of the law from within this standpoint.

We find once more than we have to hold the balance between apparent opposites. In the first place, we must assert the unequivocal Christian position of the passage. "No one could have written the passage but a Christian; it is the experience of the unregenerate .... interpreted in a regenerate mind."<sup>1</sup> R. Bultmann in particular<sup>2</sup> emphasises that only the Christian realises the situation which is described in 7:7-25. G. Bornkamm<sup>3</sup> pays tribute to Kummel's work in this connection, "Of course,

1. J. Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", E.G.T., 2, p.639.

2. "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.266 and also the general tenor of his two important essays "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", and "Christ the End of the Law". cf. also P. Althaus, "Paulus und Luther über den Menschen", 1963, p.30; W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.159; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.152; A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., p.147 nll4 (on Rom. 7:24); P. Bläser, "Das Gesetz bei Paulus", 1941, p.116; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.198; O. Michel, op. cit., p.184 (cf. p.187). H. Braun emphasises the converse which is the Christological basis of salvation in Paul, "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", Z.Th.K., 56 (1959), p.17.

3. op. cit., p.89. cf. pp.97, 101.



the misery of the unredeemed man is described from the standpoint of the redeemed man. Only from this perspective is his existence in its radical loss under law, sin and death properly recognised. This understanding, already demanded by the context, has been carefully established and developed at all points by W.G. Kummel, and now only a few exegetes dispute it".<sup>1</sup> 7:25a which recalls 7:6 and anticipates 8:1ff makes us aware of the Christological starting-point.

But in the second place we must state this starting-point in such a way that we do not sever all connection between the new Age and the old. Paul can talk sense to the man under the law and therefore under sin and death, because the law is holy given by God. The revelatory function of the law comes into view once more. As God has given it (but not as sin has usurped it) the law is not an enemy but a friend, in fact a παιδαγωγός (Gal. 3:24), a guardian or custodian,<sup>2</sup> until Christ should come. O. Kuss<sup>3</sup> grasps this: "Der Mensch vor Jesus Christus und ohne Jesus Christus war der Sünde und dem Tode hoffnungslos preisgegeben, und es fehlte gewiss nicht vollständig an Zeichen, die ein gewisses Bewusstsein seiner Situation in ihm wachwerden lassen konnten, auch wenn er die ganze Tiefe seiner Not niemals auszuloten vermochte. Erst der

1. H.J. Schoeps likewise, "Paul", 1961, p.184 (cf. p.191 nl), acknowledges Kummel's study with approval and says, "Hence ch. 7, as Kummel, Bultmann, Bornkamm, Dahl, and others have pointed out, represents in the first-person form a phenomenological account of Adamic man under the law, judged from the standpoint of Christian experience".

2. N.E.B. reads "a kind of tutor" which we think an unhappy choice. R.S.V. gives "custodian".

3. op. cit., p.459.

Gerettete aber, der zurückblickt, kann ganz erkennen, welch tödlichem Verhängnis er entronnen ist ...." R.N. Longenecker<sup>1</sup> also makes the necessary qualification (although he goes on to draw certain implications with which we disagree) when he says, "Without doubt Romans 7 is a Christian utterance. But it need not be viewed as an exclusively Christian conviction". O.Michel<sup>2</sup> uses qualifying terms which both affirm the connection and yet assert the difference when he says that in 7:7-25 we are dealing with a human need exhibited through the proclamation of the Gospel which not only can be experienced but indeed must be experienced in this profound and unlimited way only by Christians. G. Bornkamm<sup>3</sup> too, brings out that there is both a connection with the past and a radically new understanding, "The misery of man referred to by Rom. 7 is disclosed only from beyond myself, i.e. from faith. Of course, that does not mean that the contradiction (by which he means the conflict or split) is only the mark of the believer, but that what the contradiction of man under the law, sin and death means is disclosed only in faith".

We can affirm that Jesus Christ is the starting-point in another way, by recalling the dramatic form of presentation. The "I" does not see things from its own standpoint because it has none. The dramatic form enables Paul to make the "I" see from the standpoint given to it,

---

1. op. cit., p.96.

2. op. cit., p.181.

3. op. cit., pp.95f.

which is essentially ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ , ὑπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν , ὑπὸ νόμον .

The "I" can only play the role which Paul has given it and say what Paul makes it say. It is a technical device, an imaginary contrivance, a literary puppet which moves as the operator wishes. Therefore we have to regard the "I" on two levels. In a secondary sense it speaks as the law and therefore sin and death make it speak, or in terms of the dramatic figure it plays its assigned role only over against the other roles. The "I" therefore acts and speaks as a result of its encounter with the law. The law which in turn has been usurped by sin and leads only to death compels the "I" to act and speak thus. In the primary sense however the "I" acts and speaks as Paul makes it. The internal action of the drama is known and understood and manipulated by Paul from within his own position which is Christian. It is a case of the potter and the clay. Perhaps sermon-making may afford an analogy. The sermon is determined from without, that is, by the preacher. But it has also, in a sense, a structure of its own, one thought leads to another and the end product is not always predictable when the page is blank.

THE LITERARY FORM OF 7:7-25.CHAPTER 6.

We have reached the conclusion that in respect to literary form 7:7-25 is an explicit dramatisation. It is an interlude in the Epistle cast in a dramatic form and designed in the interest of a theological argument. We can sketch the dramatisation in a grossly over-simplified way thus: in the passage we meet the policeman (law); the villain (sin bringing death); the struggle (the famous conflict or split); the rescuer who is from God (Jesus Christ). Under cover of this dramatic presentation a theological analysis of the nature and function of the law is offered.

The Genesis Allusion in 7:7-13.

It is important for our argument to recognise that in 7:7-13, in particular vv7, 9, 11, we have an allusion to the opening Chapters of Genesis. We submit that the features which bear a resemblance to Genesis, Chapters 2-3, are too numerous for this allusion to be denied with full conviction. C.H. Dodd<sup>1</sup> says of the connection, "Translated into terms of individual experience" the story which is found in Genesis 2-3 runs as 7:9-11. "It fits like a glove; and there are enough verbal echoes of the Greek translation of Gen. iii to make it likely that Paul actually had the passage in mind". We suggest that the denial of the Genesis reference raises more problems than does the recognition. We agree that any one of the particular points of resemblance on its own might be

---

1. op. cit., p.106. cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.185.

interpreted otherwise. The cumulative effect however points quite definitely to Genesis. We shall therefore examine vv7-13 in this light. We have in mind at this point only the question of a Genesis allusion. There are other matters of importance in the section to which we shall return later.

a. 7:7. We note first the emphasis on ἐπιθυμία meaning "desire" or "longing", a word of very common use in the Epistles of Paul. It is found in three senses - good, bad and neutral. The sense must be established on each occasion of use from the context. Here it is used in the bad sense meaning desire for something forbidden.<sup>1</sup> Desire belongs to the heart (1:24), that is, to the centre of the personality. It represents the basic drives of human nature without which man is not man. R. Bultmann<sup>2</sup> says of ἐπιθυμία, "the original meaning of 'desire' is simply the direction in which one yearns". The descriptive terms which we use for these desires will depend on the terminology of our biological - psychological standpoint. No human life is possible without ἐπιθυμία. It becomes good or bad when set against a frame of reference. Such a frame is supplied by law.<sup>3</sup> In the bad sense ἐπιθυμία is closely

1. In 1 Thess. 2:17 and Phil. 1:23 we find the good sense. Paul's most common use is the bad sense, cf. 1:24; 6:12; 13:14; 1 Thess. 4:5; Gal. 5:16, 24; and see also Col. 3:5; Ephes. 2:3; 4:22. ἐπιθυμῶν appears in 13:9; Gal. 5:17; 1 Cor. 10:6. ἐπιθυμητής appears in 1 Cor. 10:6.

2. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.225.

3. The sexual desire, which is morally neutral, is included in ἐπιθυμία as one drive among many. It should not be emphasised in this context.

connected with the ἁρξ. It is likewise connected with the ἁρξ in this use, not with the ἁρξ as such, but only in as far as the latter is ruled by the ἁρξ, that is, by the ἁρξ as sinful.

ἐπιθυμία in v7c is parallel to ἡμάρτια in v7b. The former is a particular instance of the latter and is related to it as the concrete to the general.<sup>1</sup> It involves what C.K. Barrett<sup>2</sup> calls "that exaltation of the ego" which is the essence of sin. It thus distorts the dependent relation of creature to Creator. In Col. 3:5 ἐπιθυμία is described as idolatry which involves the transfer to things or to self or to another of that which properly belongs to God alone.

The identification of the prohibition οὐκ ἐπιθυμῆτε is an important question. Three answers have been given. It has been understood as the Tenth Commandment of the Decalogue; as the commandment of Gen. 2:17; and as a quasi-psychological analysis which describes an experience of every individual, which would be a mythological experience in the Jungian sense.<sup>3</sup> We dismiss this last explanation expressed in terms of a psychological reduction. While an observation is certainly made which has psychological connections, this fact is quite incidental to the main concern which is the relation between the law and sin. The choice must lie between the first two or in a combination of them. We hold that there is a double reference in the prohibition.

1. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, "A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature", (ed. R.W. Funk), 1961, para. 443,3, amplifies, "as well as the ἡμάρτια mentioned above". But cf. also para. 452,3.

2. op. cit., p.141. Barrett continues, "... his desire becomes the law of his being".

3. cf. F. Fordham, "An Introduction to Jung's Psychology", 1959, pp.26f.



The reference to the Tenth Commandment (Ex. 20:17; Deut. 5:21 LXX) is undeniable.<sup>1</sup> The Law of Moses has already been in sight in the Epistle. The relation of the Gospel to the Torah in particular and to the Old Testament in general was a major issue in the years preceding the writing of Romans, nor was it a dead issue at the time of writing although the main battle had been fought and won. Paul the Christian ex-Pharisee, writing to a Church which includes Jewish Christians and from a background of Jewish and Judaizing opposition during his missions, has the Mosaic Law in front of his mind. But this is so in a way that does not exclude a wider reference. The Law of Moses does not exhaust the law of God, as the reference to the Gentiles and their "law" in 2:14f shows and as the argument of 7:1-6 also suggests.

It has often been noted<sup>2</sup> that the Tenth Commandment is quoted here in an abridged form. The object or objects of the verb is omitted. We submit that this omission is purposeful and significant. What Paul regards as crucial for his argument is not so much the Tenth Commandment formulated in the traditional way, but the essence of the Commandment, that is, the principle underlying it. It is the desire for what another has, even without any supporting action, which is wrong in itself. Paul is interested in the root of sin rather than the fruit and so the emphasis

1. So W.G. Kümmel, "Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus", 1929, p.56; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.165; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.102 n7; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.185; P. Benoit, "La Loi et la Croix d'après Saint Paul (Rom. VII, 7 - VIII, 4)", *Revue Biblique*, 47(1938), p.483; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.141; O. Michel, op. cit., p.172; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.149; J. Murray, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1967, p.249 etc. cf. Rom. 13:9.

2. cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.185; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.141; O. Michel, op. cit., p.172; S. Lyonnet, "Tu ne convoiteras pas: Rom.vii.7", *Neotestamentica et Patristica, Freundesgabe Oscar Cullmann*, ed. W.C. van Unnik, 1962, p.158.

is on ἐπιθυμία and παράβασις does not appear. The fact of the abbreviation opens the door to an extension of the reference. It is not just the commandment as Mosaic but the commandment as Divine imperative which is significant.<sup>1.</sup> We need more space than the Tenth Commandment alone can offer. Our attention then swings between the Decalogue and the Paradise narrative.

It is interesting and we think significant to note how various commentators proceed on their exegesis at this point, no matter whether they restrict the reference of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις to the Tenth Commandment or understand a wider reference. In fact they lapse speedily into precisely the theological-mythological terms which characterise Genesis 3.<sup>2.</sup>

W.G. Kummel<sup>3.</sup> has the virtue, if it may be called such, of holding consistently to his view that νόμος and ἐντολή refer solely to the Decalogue and that Genesis 3 does not enter into the picture in the prohibition of v7c. He advances the following reasons.

1. The reference is to the Tenth Commandment alone in a generalised form. But we reply that this qualification is itself significant and opens the door to a wider reference.

2. Chapters 5 and 7 are not to be harmonised. But we maintain that this breaks the unity of the Epistle and have argued to the contrary.

1. If we use the phrase "categorical imperative", we should not suppose that Paul is thinking in Kantian terms. cf. J. Blank, op. cit., pp.13f.

2. cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.93; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.148; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.141; O. Michel, op. cit., p.172, F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., pp.185f; K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, pp.82f; J. Murray, op. cit., p.252 (on 7:10). The reference to Augustine and the pear tree, ("Confessions", Book 2) which is often made, is likewise significant in this connection.

3. op. cit., pp.55f.

3. He stresses that ἐντολή in v8, in relation to νόμος in v7, can be understood only as a special instance of the Decalogue. But if we recognise a double reference we then have scope enough to relate the two without difficulty.

4. He suggests that a Genesis reference would require οὐ φάγεσθε (Gen. 2:17 LXX) and μη' ἀφῆθε (Gen. 3:3 LXX) rather than οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. But it is not the action but rather the motive behind the action which interests Paul. He does not require to use οὐ φάγεσθε or μη' ἀφῆθε any more than he needs to use παράβησις. Paul is master of his terms and not their slave. We suspect that the vigour of W.G. Kümmel's repeated insistence betrays a doubt in his own mind.

P. Bläser,<sup>1</sup> like W.G. Kümmel, denies a Genesis reference but makes a reservation that the Paradise precept is the example of how sin becomes real in man and credits the passage with a remote influence on vv7-13. It becomes as it were an archetype of sin. P. Benoit<sup>2</sup> supports a salvation history view of the passage very strongly, but excludes a Genesis reference here which we find very surprising. M.-J. Lagrange<sup>3</sup> sees the Mosaic Law in the main but understands the argument to expand in a way which embraces all positive Divine law. The Mosaic Law was the perfect example of the latter, as was also the Genesis precept for man in the state of innocence. He understands both Sinai and Paradise and comments on vv7-12 accordingly. R. Bultmann seems to leave open whether

1. "Des Gesetz bei Paulus", 1941, p.115 n77.

2. op. cit.

3. op. cit., pp.165f, 172.

or not a Genesis reference appears in vv7-13.<sup>1</sup> Our impression is that he leans in favour rather than against.

S. Lyonnet<sup>2</sup> has offered at some length a defence of a Genesis allusion in 7:7. He gives six reasons which we summarise as follows.

1. The Tenth Commandment is not used in its traditional formula but because it expresses the essence of law. This permits us to look in a wider direction to a more radical understanding.

2. The formula of v7c is already found to the letter in the Palestinian Targum on Ex. 20:17 and Deut. 2:21. It is used there in an absolute sense of covetousness in general independent of the object.

3. In 1 Cor. 10:6 covetousness is the sin quite apart from the violation of a Mosaic precept.

4. In the "vocabulary of sin" in Genesis 3 only covetousness appears in the narrative of the first sin. It is presented as a prototype of all the others. The sequence in Genesis of commandment, covetousness, sin, death, is precisely the sequence of Romans 7:7ff.

5. In three Talmudic treatises<sup>3</sup> - Shabbath 145b-146a; Yebamoth 103a-103b; Abodah Zarah 22b (in which the saying is attributed to R. Johanan) - the origin of covetousness is located in the occasion of the original sin.

1. cf. "Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus", Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments, 1967, p.208 and nl3. Bultmann can say in the body of the text, "Sünde ist also das Selbst-verfügen-wollen des Menschen, das Selbst-Anspruch-erheben, das Sein-wollen wie Gott". cf. also his "Theology of the New Testament", I, p.250, the first paragraph of which ends, "And it is quite possible that in Rom. 7:7-11 Paul has Adam in mind, the prototype of mankind, who, of course, also lived without the Law of Moses". Bultmann's language in commenting on 7:7 and 7:7ff certainly reflects the Genesis thought patterns.

2. op. cit., pp.158ff.

3. cf. "The Babylonian Talmud", ed. I. Epstein, Seder Mo'ed II, 1938, p.738; Seder Nashim II, 1936, p.711; Seder Nezikin VII, 1935, p.114.

The Law given at Sinai however delivered Israel from covetousness. The Law is thus related to covetousness as antidote to poison. A habit of thought is therefore suggested which linked the Law and the Garden with covetousness.

6. Judaism opposed Sinai to Eden much less than we do. Lyonnet appeals to Sirach 17, in which every precept of God is law, while at the same time it grants the Law of Moses pre-eminence. He also appeals to Sirach 44, in which Abraham is said to have kept the law of the Most High. Likewise in the Targum on Gen. 2:15, Adam was placed in the Garden, not to cultivate the soil but to practise the law which is indeed identified symbolically with the Tree of Life.<sup>1</sup>

Lyonnet concludes that as in Chapter 4 Paul chooses Abraham the righteous man to support his thesis of justification by faith, so in Chapter 7 he chooses Adam the covetous man to support his thesis of the true function of the law. We believe that Lyonnet strengthens the case for recognising Genesis in 7:7. We think he overstates his case in withdrawing from the Decalogue as he seems to do. This is quite unnecessary. In order to do justice to the total situation a double reference should be maintained. The fact that it is not always possible in the course of exegesis to measure precisely the priority of Genesis or Exodus in the reference of the text, does no harm to our position. The chosen literary form precludes such precision as we shall seek to demonstrate.

A further consideration should be borne in mind. It is surprising that so little mention is made of the teaching of Jesus in the literature

---

1. cf. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.94 on the pre-Mosaic Torah; G.F. Moore, "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim", 1, 1927, pp.262ff.

on Romans 7. Only W.D. Davies,<sup>1.</sup> as far as we have noticed, recalls in this connection our Lord's emphasis on the inwardness of true religion, the crucial importance of motive and intention, and the harmony that is required between attitude and action. Paul no longer approaches the Genesis narrative or the Decalogue directly but through the impact and the teaching of Jesus. In that light he can better understand the relation between sin and covetousness, and between sin/covetousness and the law. Perhaps it is as important to recognise Paul's reappraisal of the precept, whatever its origin, in the light of Jesus, as it is to delimit too sharply an allusion to the Decalogue over against the Paradise narrative.

b. We will now look at v8. In the context νόμος and ἐντέλη are used synonymously. The variation is to be explained stylistically, as a way of avoiding tedious repetition. ἐντέλη is related to νόμος as the part to the whole. We allow a double reference in keeping with our view of οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶεις. Genesis is in view as well as the Decalogue. The difficulty in stating precisely the use made of the ἐντέλη by sin is indicated by the frequency with which commentators have recourse to further metaphor in order to explain Paul's metaphor. We find them borrowing illustrations from chemistry,<sup>2.</sup> from botany,<sup>3.</sup> from dynamics,<sup>4.</sup>

1. "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, p.141. H. Jonas, "Philosophical Meditation on the Seventh Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans", The Future of our Religious Past: Essays in honour of Rudolf Bultmann, ed. J.M. Robinson, 1971, pp.347-9, contrasts the anthropological premisses of Jesus and Paul.

2. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.141 (reagent, catalyst); S. Lyonnet, op. cit., p.162 (antidote); O. Michel, op. cit., p.173 (poison).

3. E. Brunner, op. cit., p.59 (plant growth), as also A. Nygren, op. cit., p.279; J.B. Lightfoot, "Notes on Epistles of Paul", 1895, p.302 (tree growth).

4. H.C.C. Moule, "Romans", 1903, p.127 (fulcrum); K. Barth, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1933, p.253, (lever).



from physics,<sup>1.</sup> from sport,<sup>2.</sup> from biology,<sup>3.</sup> from architecture,<sup>4.</sup> from warfare.<sup>5.</sup> This recourse to metaphor supports our view that a Genesis reference is before us here. The explanatory metaphors are reminiscent of the metaphor par excellence, the figure of all figures, which is the theological-mythological account of Genesis 1-3.

Some commentators find a reminiscence of the serpent in the Garden in the term νεκρί. F.J. Leenhardt<sup>6.</sup> comments, "....nothing resembles a dead serpent more than a living serpent so long as it does not move". The imagery is certainly effective and we could develop the thought homiletically with profit. It is impossible to say with certainty however whether Paul intended to extend the image thus far. There is sometimes a tendency for the reader or hearer to carry an image beyond the author's immediate intention in line with his own presupposition. We think the image should not be extended in this way, but we place little importance on the issue. We shall return to the meaning of νεκρί later.

c. The meaning of ἐξω in v9 is one of the problems in this passage. It is sufficient at this point to suggest that Genesis 3 provides

1. E. Ellwein, op. cit., p.247 (Feuerbrand); J.A.T. Robinson, "The Body", 1952, p.37 (tinder).

2. K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, p.82 (springboard).

3. A. Nygren, op. cit., p.279 (sleep); D.E.H. Whiteley, "The Theology of St. Paul", 1964, p.80 (hot fomentations).

4. A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.107 (das Einfallstor).

5. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p.36. cf. Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., p.127.

6. op. cit., p.186. cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.143.

the necessary background. W.G. Kummel makes much of the "pregnant" significance of ἐξ ὧν<sup>21</sup> but we think that he does not succeed in stating its content precisely and the reason is his refusal to make the Genesis connection. In similar fashion Genesis 1-3 provides the required background for the phrase ἡμεῖς νόμοι. In terms of Genesis there was a "time" when law was absent. This is difficult to understand in view of the preceding ἡμεῖς which suggests that sin was already present although inactive. We overcome the difficulty by stressing the personification of sin in the context. We are dealing with a theological analysis which borrows from the quasi-historical account in Genesis. We hope to show that an adequate exegesis can be constructed on this basis. S. Lyonnet,<sup>1.</sup> with reference to ἀνεξήνηεν<sup>2</sup>, lists compounds of ἀνα- which give a different meaning from "again". He suggests the physical sense of the adverb ἀνα<sup>3</sup> which he relates to the serpent in Eden standing erect. Again it depends how far one regards the reference as extending. The context does not really require the specific allusion to the serpent at this point.<sup>2.</sup> Its message is clear with or without the extension.<sup>3.</sup>

1. op. cit., p.157 n4. On v9 see U. Luz, "Das Geschichtverständnis des Paulus", 1968, pp.164ff.

2. It is unnecessary to read phallic symbolism here as if a psychoanalytical essay were before us. It is a theological account cast in a dramatic form and influenced by the Genesis story. K.E. Kirk, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1937, p.207, suggests that Ezekiel 37 was in Paul's mind. F. Bläser, op. cit., p.124, tries to bring out the sense of ἀνεξήνηεν by speaking of "static" energy becoming "kinetic" energy, the potential becoming actual, the dormant being activated by outside stimuli. This however raises as many questions as it answers.

3. H. Lietzmann, "An die Römer", 1928, p.74, on vv9ff says bluntly that the "I" is "die Menschheit in Adam, πότε ist die Zeit der paradiesischen Unschuld und die ἐν τῇ ἐκ τῶν ist Gen 2:16,17; 3:3....."

d. In Genesis 2:17 (cf. 3:19) death is the threatened punishment for disobedience. In 7:10 we have a reference to the fulfilment of the penal threat. Again Genesis provides the indirect background. By indirect we mean that Paul does not write with the text of Genesis open before him and his finger at the place.<sup>1</sup> Rather are the motifs of Genesis the familiar home of Paul's thought. Genesis is thus the indirect but definite background with its story of estrangement and exile.

e. In vll we meet ἐξήπατησεν. We assert a further connection with Genesis at this point. W.G. Kümmel<sup>2</sup> denies this. He points out that the verb in Gen. 3:13 LXX is the simple form ἥπατησεν and that ἐξήπατησεν is found in the LXX only at Ex. 8:29 (25), with ἥπαται as a variant. He acknowledges however that 2 Cor. 11:3 and 1 Tim. 2:14 use the intensive form ἐξήπαται and yet are connected with Genesis. This reduces the force of his argument. We should not expect Paul to employ a wooden style. He is not quoting the text directly but is using the thought-form imaginatively. Nor will Kümmel allow 2 Cor. 11:3 and 1 Tim. 2:14 any special weight in determining the significance of 7:11, on the ground that other instances can be given<sup>3</sup> in which both forms of the verb are employed in a wholly general sense. This looks to us like special pleading. There seems to be no reason why a connection between 7:11 and

1. cf. C.K. Barrett's distinction (p.143) between "telling" the Genesis story and "using" it. F.J. Leenhardt (ad loc.) says Genesis is used as a "basis".

2. op. cit., p.54.

3. eg. 15:18; 1 Cor. 3:18; 2 Thess. 2:3.

2 Cor. 11:3 and 1 Tim. 2:14 must be denied within the wider use of the verb. Although 7:11 is not so specific as the other two, the possibility of a Genesis reference is at least open. The context moreover supports this. We should not forget in addition that Paul had other terms available to him.<sup>1.</sup>

We have argued for a Genesis background to ἐξῶν in v9. ἡπεκτείνεν in v11 must be understood over against ἐξῶν and in line with ἡπέθανεν and θανεόντων in v10. The Genesis reference will therefore be kept in mind.

f. In v12 νόμος picks up the νόμος of v7 and is related to ἐντελής as already indicated. Both terms are used because they have appeared above and also for emphasis. When the one is employed the other is implied. The part can stand for the whole as the whole includes the part. At this point the Mosaic Law is mainly in view. Our basic contention that there is a double reference in the use of νόμος in 7:7ff does not depend on the exact reference at a single point. The proportion may vary from one place to another.<sup>2.</sup>

g. The construction in v13 is intricate. We note the lack of a predicate, the anacoluthon, the tautology and the two almost identical

1. In support of a Genesis reference in ἐξηπατήσεν cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.188; O. Michel, op. cit., p.174; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.144 who says v11 "is almost a quotation from Gen iii.13 ....."; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.32; A. van Dülmen, op. cit., p.110 n124 (but with reservation); M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.171. Against cf. G. Schrenk, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.550ff.

2. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.145, understands the Mosaic Code and "perhaps" Gen. 2:17. W.G. Kümmel and P. Bläser think in terms of the Decalogue only.

<sup>c/</sup>  
vcl clauses. It answers the question arising from v10 (and v11). It is indeed a clarification of v10. It answers the question, "Does the law bring death?", with a defence of the law, just as v7 answers the related question, "Is the law sin?", in similar fashion. The "death" which is in view is again to be regarded in the light of Genesis. It is neither historical nor psychological but theological and is to be seen against the Genesis myth to which the dramatisation in 7:7ff is so much indebted.

We can also support this Genesis connection from a broader base. We need look no further than Romans and Galatians to see that Paul was accustomed to build from Old Testament texts, characters, incidents and allusions. The Genesis memories have already been alerted in 5:12-21. G. Bornkamm,<sup>1</sup> while adhering to the Mosaic reference of the prohibition in 7:7, finds an analogy between 5:12ff and 7:ff, "The Adam of Rom.5:12ff speaks in the 'I' of Rom. 7:7ff."<sup>2</sup> The fact that the name "Adam" is not used in 7:7ff presents no difficulty. The name is used in 5:12ff because the purpose there requires it. The two representative men, Adam and Christ, are compared and contrasted. In 7:7ff however a different purpose is in view and therefore a different mode is employed. The "I" is an admirable cipher for this form. R.N. Longenecker<sup>3</sup> comments, "The story of the Fall is so prominent in Jewish literature that the recital of its characters is not absolutely necessary in every reference to it".

1. op. cit., pp.93f.

2. ibid. p.94. E. Brunner, op. cit., p.59 writes, "What has been said in connection with Genesis 3 in the fifth chapter ..... concerning the fall of Adam is presupposed".

3. op. cit., p.95.

O. Kuss<sup>1</sup> warns that the portrayal in vv7-11 is not just a reproduction of Genesis 3 and therefore we are not to identify the "I" offhand with Adam. In other words we must recognise the connection but we must also realise that Paul takes what he needs from the Genesis passage and uses it as he himself chooses within his purpose, exercising discretion over his material.

We know too that Paul was not alone in thinking Genesis-wise. Philo of Alexandria, his older contemporary, allegorised the Genesis story. In the apocalyptic 2 Esdras 7:118 we read, "O Adam, what have you done? Your sin was not your fall alone; it was ours also, the fall of all your descendants". (N.E.B.) In the apocalyptic 2 Baruch 54:19 we read, ".... each of us has been the Adam of his own soul".<sup>2</sup> W.D. Davies,<sup>3</sup> after a long paragraph dealing with 5:12ff and 7:7ff, says, "In all this Paul was interpreting current Rabbinic thought". In other words in his Genesis allusion in 7:7ff, Paul is drawing on the common stock of theological building material. We must remember that that stock was not as vast as it is in our day. If in our own age the application of

1. op. cit., p.449.

2. 2 Baruch 54:15-19 reads:

For though Adam first sinned  
And brought untimely death upon all,  
Yet those who were born from him  
Each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come,  
And again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come.  
Adam is, therefore, not the cause save only of his own soul  
But each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.

The translation is that of W.D. Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, pp.32f. He remarks that 2 Baruch also recognises human free will, as also 2 Esdras (4 Ezra).

3. op. cit., p.32.



Genesis 2-3 is a familiar theological and homiletical procedure, and this in a day which lacks the tight connections with Biblical modes which we find in Paul, how much more natural for Paul the Jew and Pharisee to make such an allusion.

We can defend the double reference to Sinai and to Paradise in another way. It is wrong to dissociate the two in any absolute sense. A straight line runs from one to the other. This line is not conceived as a historical line but lies within a salvation-history understanding. For Paul salvation history did not begin with Sinai nor even with the Fall but with the primal couple. The Fall and Sinai are connected events within the one great Event which is God-in-relation-to-man. We can recognise this more clearly when we realise that Moses did not create the law called by his name out of nothing.<sup>1</sup> He adopted and adapted already existing laws. There was in fact no time before Sinai, or if we like no time "between" the Fall and Sinai when Israel was without law. They were without the Mosaic Code certainly but they were never without law in the sense of a relation to God defined from the side of God. If we assume otherwise we affirm that they lived without God and so we cut the nerve of their existence.

We submit therefore that there is a clear allusion in 7:7ff to the narrative in Genesis 2-3. The onus of proof surely lies heavily

---

1. See the comments on Ex. 20 by D.M.G. Stalker, "Peake 1962", pp.227f.

on those who deny such.<sup>1.</sup>

### The Dramatic Form of 7:7-25.

We appeal then to the Genesis allusion in 7:7-13 in support of our assertion that an explicit dramatisation is before us in 7:7-25. It may be that the Genesis drama draws Paul into this particular form of presentation by a process of association of ideas under the unfluence of 5:12ff. Or on the other hand it may be that Paul conceived the dramatic form independently and then worked the Genesis drama into it as like to like. The broad context suggests that Paul is in a "model-building" frame of mind. We have the two representative men in 5:12ff, the two masters in 6:15ff and the two husbands in 7:1-6.<sup>2.</sup> Then in 7:7ff the pattern of thought expressed in terms of two develops into a formal and sustained analogy. Instead of adding a further "two", namely, sin and law, Paul expands his argument into a four character presentation in which sin, law, death and the "I" appear.

---

1. In support of the Genesis allusion in 7:7ff see F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., pp.184f; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.148; A.M. Hunter, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1955, p.71; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.32; E. Best, "The Letter of Paul to the Romans", 1967, p.81; W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.151; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., pp.165ff; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.143; O. Michel, op. cit., p.183; R.P. Shedd, op. cit., p.124. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., pp.92-96, discusses the question at length as does U. Luz, "Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus", 1968, pp.164ff. The lineage of this view of a Genesis reference is ancient, going back to Methodius, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret.

2. The military metaphors of 7:23 and probably ἐφορμή, (γν8, 11) are also indications of this pattern of thought. of. also οὐκ ὄντα in 6:23, on which see A.S. Way, "The Letters of St. Paul and Hebrews", 1911, p.126 nl.

An appreciation of the dramatic form of the passage throws light on the problem of the vocabulary. There is a flavour in the terminology which is unusual to Paul. There is a certain monotony which is interrupted by terms which are "hapax legomenoi" in Paul's Epistles.<sup>1</sup> The style is somewhat tortuous.<sup>2</sup> The argument becomes repetitive in the later verses in a confusing way and surprising terms intrude in vv22-23. It is difficult to account for all this. Is it that "Homer nods"? Has the digression which begins in 7:7 robbed Paul of his fluency? Is the diatribal style of which traces are present here<sup>3</sup> more suited to oratory than to the special genre of Church Epistle?

We submit that our view of the passage as a dramatisation clarifies the problem. The fact is that the dramatic presentation is a tool unshaped to Paul's hand. He is not at home with this technique. Hence the rather turgid flow of the passage, especially in the later stages.

1. These are ἀφορμὴν λαβεῖν vv8, 11; ἀναζήν v9; ἐόνφῃ v16; παράκειται vv18, 21; ἐοικήσεσθαι v22; ἀντιβιβάτεσθε v23; τελευτήσω v24.

2. O. Michel, op. cit., p.178 nl, remarks that the style and language are "eigenartig". F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.183 nl, comments on the "hapax legomenoi", "This fact may suggest borrowing. It may also imply that the apostle is adopting a point of view which is not familiar to him". H. Braun, "Römer 7:7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", Z.Th.K., 1956, 3, notes the almost monotonous terminology and lists the occurrence of the main terms. Also cf. the "Table of Word Frequencies in Romans" against their occurrence in the other Pauline Epistles, in R.M. Grant, "A Historical Introduction to the New Testament", 1963, pp.186f.

3. cf. R. Bultmann's early monograph, "Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe", 1910, especially his conclusions pp.107ff; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.13; A.D. Nock, op. cit., pp.234f; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.140 (cf. p.43); F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.86.

We find the suggestion of E. Fuchs<sup>1</sup> that a Gnostic model underlies the passage unacceptable. O. Michel<sup>2</sup> suggests 1QS 11:7-10 and 1QH 2:6f as a basis for a possible model but does not argue the case. An unknown model, imitation of which cramped Paul's style, is certainly an attractive hypothesis but solid evidence to support such is lacking. We prefer to look directly to the Genesis model. The Genesis drama which has already been in mind in 5:12ff and the tendency towards analogical reasoning already noted give sufficient material for an adventurous mind such as Paul's to attempt a difficult and never repeated dramatic portrayal.

In the extensive literature on Romans 7:7ff we have found only scattered hints at what we affirm to be the dramatic form of the presentation. They are usually nothing more than a metaphorical allusion made in the passing and with one exception are not followed through to their conclusion. M.-J. Lagrange<sup>3</sup> can use the words "ce drame" and "les

1. "Die Freiheit des Glaubens", 1949, pp.60-62. Fuchs suggests a Gnostic Model behind 7:7-24. Paul has worked over this to produce what is before us in 7:7ff. Fuchs carves up the text with a sharp knife to uncover a dirge consisting of two stanzas each of five short lines. This is said to represent a Gnostic myth to which Paul gives an historical cast in order to refashion it in his own terms. In the Gnostic lament the "I" is the soul from the other world. Deceived by covetousness, it becomes imprisoned in the κόσμος. The supposed model begins ἐν ἐξουχίς κόσμος πόντος and reaches the climax in a plea for deliverance from the κόσμος, saying τίς με πύετται ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ? The whole construction is very ingenious but also quite arbitrary and highly imaginative. The details of the text can be better understood in other ways. The Epistle as a whole is clear evidence that the world from which Paul drew breath was not that of Gnosticism but that of the Old Testament. We shall return to this theme. cf. the criticism of Fuchs by U. Luz, op. cit., p.163 n106.

2. op. cit., p.183.

3. op. cit., pp.166, 172 and 168 respectively.

acteurs" and say, "Les trois acteurs sont donc: la loi positive divine, l'homme innocent, le peche personifie". He does not however seem to appreciate the true significance of his terms and does not follow whither they should lead. C.H. Dodd,<sup>1</sup> commenting on Moffatt's translation of 7:25, says, "There is no formal answer to the question of verse 24, and the dramatic force of the passage is impaired by supplying one". W. Manson<sup>2</sup> writes, "St. Paul has set the stage for an enquiry dictated by a purely argumentative necessity". F.J. Leenhardt,<sup>3</sup> under the influence of P. Benoit, speaks of Paul adding to the "living personages" of Chapter 5 (namely sin and death) a new, living personage which is the "I". He continues, "To enable man to speak with dramatic cogency it was natural to create an imaginary Adam as the speaker. The kinship of vv7-12 with Gen.3 shows that the apostle thought out the scene which he here constructs on the basis of the picture of Adam as at once individual and collective".<sup>4</sup> G. Bornkamm<sup>5</sup> writes of the "almost mythological pictures" which are used

1. op. cit., p.116.

2. op. cit., p.159.

3. op. cit., pp.184f.

4. *ibid.* p.185. cf. also p.181, "the drama of inner conflict described in these verses"; p.195, "in this dramatic page"; p.198, "the drama described in this page"; p.194, "... the action of the Holy Spirit is absent from the drama of the man who speaks in Rom.7".

5. op. cit., p.90. cf. also the language of the effective illustration of the theme of Rom.7 which he quotes, p.103 n29, from H. Melville's story "Billy Budd", ending "... act out to the end the part allotted to it". W. Lüthi, "The Letter to the Romans", 1961, p.97, likewise refers to a play, (Dürrenmatt, "Die Ehe des Herrn Mississippi"), as illustration in his exposition of Chapter 7. A. Whyte, "The Apostle Paul", 1903, p.131, cries, "If you would see hatred and revenge red-hot, and poured, not on the head of a hated enemy, but, what I have never read in any of your stage-tragedies, poured in all its red-hotness in upon a man's own heart; if you would see the true hatred and the true revenge, come to this New Testament theatre. Come to Paul for a right tragic author". (*italics* ~~ours~~.) Whyte understands Christian autobiography.

in 7:7ff. E. Stauffer<sup>1</sup> speaks of the law bringing sin to its full development and thus leading the human race to its "nadir". This mathematical figure of the low point suggests a shape in the moving thought of the passage which, we think, is in fact expressed in dramatic terms. C.K. Barrett,<sup>2</sup> commenting on v25, refers to the "unstudied dramatic aposiopesis" meaning the rhetorical device of stopping short for dramatic effect. A.S. Peake<sup>3</sup> can say, "His own breast was a tiny stage on which the vast elemental conflict of good and evil was reenacted". C.J. Vaughan,<sup>4</sup> commenting on 8:2, remarks, "Here first enters the third combatant", referring to the law of the Spirit which turns the scale in favour of good. T. Fahy<sup>5</sup> describes 7:7ff as "the famous diatribe" and says, "Then the new character, whom we will call the speaker, takes up the argument". J. Blank<sup>6</sup> writes of 7:7-25, "Der Text gehört neben manchen anderen, wie der berühmte Chor aus der Antigone des Sophokles..." K. Kertelge<sup>7</sup> accounts for the change to the present tense in v14 as due

1. *op. cit.*, p.359.

2. *op. cit.*, p.151.

3. *op. cit.*, p.305.

4. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", 1874, p.147.

5. "St. Paul's Romans were Jewish Converts", Irish Theological Quarterly, 26 (1959), 186.

6. "Der gespaltene Mensch", Bibel und Leben, (1968), 11, cf.14.

7. "Exegetische Überlegungen zum Verständnis der paulinischen Anthropologie nach Römer 7", Z.N.T.W., 62 (1971), 108, cf. 109 where he says the "I" is a mythological way of speaking, also 113f.



to the liveliness of the portrayal ("die Lebhaftigkeit der Schilderung"). S. Lyonnet<sup>1.</sup> writes, "La ressemblance ne se limite pas aux personnages du drame". A.D. Nock,<sup>2.</sup> enumerating the various approaches to the interpretation of Romans 7, says, "... others have held the 'I' of the narrative to be a device of dramatisation ...", but he gives no references.

The only essay of substance which we have found which grasps clearly the dramatic form of the presentation in 7:7ff is that by P. Benoit.<sup>3.</sup> He speaks of actors in a cosmic drama. He thinks of Paul, still under the influence of 5:12ff and in line with the intermediate Chapter 6 which continues in terms of two masters on this same level of historical personification, adopting a rhetorical or dramatic procedure. The "I" is thought of as the theatre in which the action takes place, rather than as a character in the plot, although this thought emerges too as it can hardly fail to do. The law is an actor in this cosmic drama and plays a double role, that of teacher on account of his precept and that of judge on account of his sentence.<sup>4.</sup> He appears along with the other actors who already in 5:12ff occupy the stage. Benoit can also

1. "L'Histoire du Salut selon le Chapitre VII de L'Épître aux Romains", *Biblica*, 43 (1962), 134. See also his quotation (p.131) from P. Prat, ("Théologie de saint Paul", 1, 1908, p.272), "Quel est le héros de ce drame lugubre..."

2. op. cit., p.68.

3. "La Loi et la Croix d'Après Saint Paul", *Revue Biblique*, 47 (1938), 481-509, especially 484, 485, 490, 493, 506.

4. *ibid.* p.490.

speak of the battlefield of the "I".<sup>1</sup> He understands the drama to unfold in a rather different sequence from our conception of it. For him the drama begins in 5:12ff and is then resumed in 7:7ff which extends 5:12-21 as the Second Act in the drama.<sup>2</sup> But he can also speak of the Second Act opening in v9<sup>3</sup> which leads to confusion. He sees the culmination in the Third Act which comprises 8:1-4 in which a new character comes on the stage who is Jesus Christ, the hero of the plot. It should be noted that the primary interest of Benoit's article is to interpret Paul's concept of the law in the light of the Death of Christ. He does not attack the problem of 7:7-25 directly but within this larger context. Perhaps this prevents him from grasping what we hold to be the correct shape of the drama and the essential unity of 7:7-25.<sup>4</sup>

There are two other essays which have engaged our attention in particular and we are convinced that these point in the direction in which we have travelled. The first is by B. Ramm.<sup>5</sup> He claims that F. Dostoevsky's novel, "The Double", is the best commentary which he has

1. op. cit., p.485.

2. ibid. p.486.

3. ibid. p.487.

4. P. Bläser, op. cit., p.119 n88, recognises clearly that P. Benoit has developed at length as a dramatic procedure what W.G. Kümmel claims to be a rhetorical device. Benoit himself (op. cit., p.485 nl) regrets that Kümmel did not pursue the line opened up by "cette excellente conception", namely, his understanding of the "I" as a rhetorical device, a "Stilform".

5. "'The Double' and Romans 7", Christianity To-day, XV (14, April 9, 1971), 642-644.

ever read on Romans 7.<sup>1</sup> Its main character is a schizophrenic clerk, by name Golyadkin, whose life is complicated by the appearance of an imaginary double, an alter ego, the product of his hallucinations whom Dostoevsky calls "Golyadkin Two". Ramm alleges correspondence between the irrational behaviour patterns in the psychotic clerk and certain features of Romans 7. He identifies the "I" of 7:7ff with Paul himself in his Christian standing<sup>2</sup> and then differentiates a "Paul One" and a "Paul Two", who strive together (Romans 7) in the transition from death and resurrection with Christ (Romans 6) to life in the Spirit (Romans 8).

We think it significant that Ramm has gone to a novelist and to a novel which is written in a highly dramatic style. This is the result of true insight which, we claim, reflects in an indirect way the literary genre of Romans 7:7ff as a dramatisation. The essay however is seriously deficient in important respects. Ramm's analysis is too psychological. He fails to recognise the primary, objective, theological analysis within which the subjective references of the "I" lie in the passage as their given context. His description of Paul as the victim of "spiritual schizophrenia"<sup>3</sup> does not accord with Paul's attitudes as these appear

1. *ibid.* p.643.

2. We think that we hear clear echoes of A. Nygren's interpretation of Romans 7 in Ramm's article.

3. *op. cit.*, p.644. The intensity in the exposition of Rom.7 evident in A. Whyte, *op. cit.*, pp.127ff, the self-styled "specialist in sin", resembles the literary intensity in character portrayal of Dostoevsky which has impressed Ramm.

elsewhere in his writings.<sup>1.</sup> Ramm's rather brief exposition lacks close exegetical consideration. It limits its scope to the alleged resemblances between the "I" and Dostoevsky's fictitious character. While we make allowances for the limited perspective of the article, its deficiencies highlight the crucial importance of thorough exegesis for the interpretation of Romans 7.

The remaining essay is of a very different kind. H. Jonas,<sup>2.</sup> starting from the position on Romans 7 of R. Bultmann, attempts to translate the content of Paul's statements into the language of an existential form description. He seeks to understand 7:7-25 in terms of an existential analysis of Paul's self-experience. He outlines the structure of man's being in which the primal sin is inevitably committed and constantly renewed. The "I" is constituted as a being which is essentially self-related. Consciousness is essentially self-consciousness. This gives

---

1. Our main impression of Paul is that of sanity and vigour. The one Epistle which does give the impression of depletion of vitality in the storm and stress of life is 2 Corinthians. The general picture given of Paul however is one of health and positive mental attitudes. His quite remarkable programme and accomplishment in mission, does not suggest a sick man. Regarding the "thorn in the flesh", we think this may probably be a form of recurring fever or eye disease and not epilepsy, although J. Munck's suggestion of chronic frustration due to his opponents' constant harrassment is also a possibility. We have already indicated our rejection of any interpretation of the Damascus road encounter in terms of hallucination. If Ramm's view were correct, we would be inclined to paraphrase Jonathan Edwards and say, "Fly abroad mighty spiritual schizophrenia".

2. "Philosophical Meditation on the Seventh Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans", The Future of our Religious Past, Essays in Honour of R. Bultmann, ed. J.M. Robinson, 1971, pp.333-350.

the necessary condition of freedom and its inevitable self-frustration. This basic reflexivity is seen primarily in the will, which is described as "continuously operative decision about itself",<sup>1</sup> but also in the capacity to objectify "the universe of the other".<sup>2</sup> This means that the "I" sets itself not only over against the "world" but over against itself. There is thus a "cleavage", a "distance from oneself",<sup>3</sup> which results from this objectifying mode of existence which in turn proceeds from the reflexivity of his nature, or in other words from the constitution of the "I" as a being essentially self-related.

When Jonas comes to explain the nature of the freedom which has its ontological basis in the primordial reflexiveness, and the way in which it inevitably "dispossesses itself", he personifies freedom. It is both actor and observer. It fails to live "within the execution of its self-chosen action"<sup>4</sup> and becomes an "observer"<sup>5</sup>. This lapse from the role of actor to that of the spectator with its accompanying security, expresses at this point in the essay by a metaphor from the drama, what is elsewhere expressed from the philosophical standpoint and language of

1. op. cit., p.338.

2. ibid. p.339.

3. ibid. p.339.

4. ibid. p.339.

5. ibid. p.340.

existential analysis.<sup>1.</sup>

What is Jonas seeking to do in his essay? He is engaged in an exercise in transposition. He is trying to remove what is being said from one form of expression (a dramatisation) into another (an existential form description).<sup>2.</sup> But this is precisely the kind of thing Paul himself has done in 7:7ff in the first place. Paul has certain theological presuppositions. In 7:7ff he transposes their content into a literary form which is a dramatisation, in order to convey his message to his readers. H. Jonas is therefore doing in a different way what Paul has already done in his own way.

We submit that B. Ramm and H. Jonas have grasped the substance of the matter which is that an analysis is being offered in 7:7ff. They have not however grasped the true form of the presentation but are rather groping towards this recognition. They realise that, as it were, a "code" is being used to convey a message without recognising the exact structure of that code. Instead they have substituted yet another code, in the case of Jonas that of spatial metaphors and allusions as the medium of an

---

1. We note in Jonas' essay: a. his frequent use of spatial concepts - the space between the "I" and the other (which includes the "I") gives the "I" its freedom (p.339); the distance from oneself (p.339); the plight of depth (p.347). b. his personification of freedom (p.339f), it is actor and observer. c. his admission that in analysing the relation between possibility and necessity, he can do no more than resort to allusions and metaphors (p.344).

2. Jonas specifically disclaims that he is giving an exegesis of the passage but rather offers "a freely philosophical reflection or meditation on the general existential phenomena which by hypothesis may be those that underlie the entire Pauline statement as its premise in the human constitution" (p.335).



existentialist interpretation, in the case of Ramm the psychotic behaviour of a character from a novel by Dostoevsky. These two writers are saying to us, "Change the form and you will grasp the content". Our assertion in this thesis is, "Recognise the dramatic form and understand the content better".<sup>1.</sup>

We have to admit that the theatre is not a sphere of human activity from which we would have expected Paul to borrow.<sup>2.</sup> The paucity of any references to such in his Epistles is evidence that he was in all probability inhibited by the inherited Jewish antipathy to that mode of

1. We mention two interesting works which may seem totally unrelated to the matter under review. The impression has grown on us that in them we are dealing with something related to the presentation in Rom.7. The first is a sermon by C.S. Lewis ("Transposition", Screwtape Proposes a Toast", 1965, pp.75ff). He affirms a correspondence between the sensory level of perception and theological understanding, that is, between fact and meaning. "A kind of transposition or adaptation from a richer to a poorer medium" (p.81) enables theological and philosophical constructions to be made. The one system thus becomes the sign of the other. The second is the novel by H. Hesse, "The Glass Bead Game", Penguin Books, 1972. He portrays the intellectual élite in the imaginary province of Castalia in a future age, pursuing the acme of their activities, the Glass Bead Game. He explains that ".... the sign language and grammar of the Game, constitute a kind of highly developed secret language drawing upon several sciences and arts, but especially mathematics and music.... and capable of expressing and establishing inter-relationships between the content and conclusions of nearly all scholarly disciplines. The Glass Bead Game is thus a mode of playing with the total contents and values of our culture ....." (p.18). In Rom. 7:7ff we may say in terms of these writers that Paul is adapting a medium of interpretation, or he is establishing inter-relationships between one cultural form (the drama) and another (his Hebrew-Christian theology). He borrows the dramatic form in the interest of a theological construction and says, "Let this form aid understanding of that content". The form is strictly subordinate to the content and the content is not exhausted by the form.

2. S. Cave, "The Gospel of St. Paul", 1928, p.21, says that Paul as a Jew would shun the theatre.

expression which we find so extensively in history in the cultural phenomenon of the drama. "The drama is one of the least developed forms of literary expressions in Hebrew Literature. Some have attributed its modest achievements to the inherent contradiction between the monotheistic spirit of the Jewish religion and the dualism implicit in drama....."<sup>1</sup>. In the course of a lengthy, composite article on "Theater",<sup>2</sup> L. Sowden writes,<sup>3</sup> "Neither biblical nor talmudic literature contains anything which can be described as 'theater' or 'drama' in the modern sense of these terms. The Song of Moses (Ex. 15), with its choric refrain in the Song of Miriam, has often been cited as containing the rudiments of drama, which began as a combination of song and dance. The same has been suggested for the Song of Songs, and various attempts have been made with limited success to arrange this book for performance. It would be rash to suggest that writers of the Bible were quite untouched by the Athenian drama which had developed on the fringes of the Israelite world in the fifth century B.C.E. The Book of Job (dating probably from the fifth or fourth century B.C.E.) conforms in a general way to dramatic principles. It is written largely in dialogue, it shows expression of character, and

---

1. G. Shaked, "Hebrew Drama", Encyclopaedia Judaica, 6, 1971, Col.193. He also notes that "Dramatic elements and dialogues are already found in the Book of Job and, at a later period, in the piyyut (the Hebrew liturgical hymn) ....."

2. Encyclopaedia Judaica, 15, 1971, Col.'s 1049-1077.

3. ibid. Col. 1049.

it contains dramatic incidents. If there were in biblical writing tendencies toward formal dramatic composition, they reached their furthest development in Job. However, presentations of the Book of Job on the stage have fallen short of proving that it was written for performance."

He continues<sup>1.</sup> with regard to the post-biblical period, "On the whole, post-biblical literature is without any works intended for performance in a theater. But the rabbis were fully aware of and generally disapproved of the theaters, amphitheaters, and circuses that existed in their Hellenistic-Roman world. They discouraged attendance at the theater except in certain circumstances ..... The rabbis of the Talmud taught that one should not go to theaters or circuses because sacrifices were offered in honour of the idols. When no such sacrifices were offered it was still prohibited to be present since persons watching the clowns and buffoons performing would transgress the prohibition against sitting in 'the seat of the scornful' (Ps.1:1)."

L. Sowden asserts<sup>2.</sup> that evidence suggests that the pious kept aloof from the theatre but many others did not. "It is considered that one of the purposes of Ezekiel of Alexandria in writing his biblical tragedies<sup>3.</sup> was to divert Jews from attendance at pagan theaters. This

1. op. cit., 15, Col.'s 1049-1050.

2. ibid. Col. 1050.

3. L. Sowden describes these as the exception to the absence of drama in post-biblical writing. The date is first century B.C.E.

indicates that Jews were regularly to be found among the theater-going public."<sup>1</sup> He goes on,<sup>2</sup> "The theaters that arose in Palestine during the Hellenistic period were largely swept away by the Maccabean War (167 B.C.E.), but a revival of forms of entertainment took place in the next century under Herod, and the larger cities including Jerusalem had theaters, amphitheaters, and hippodromes. These were gentile institutions. There was no attempt at creating a Jewish playhouse."

Paul then, it may be assumed, did not express his mind naturally or easily from this direction.<sup>3</sup> We have combed through the Epistles in search of words and figures derived from the drama with the most meagre results. Θέατρον is used figuratively in 1 Cor.4:9, on which Arndt-Gingrich comments, "what one sees at the theater, 'a play, spectacle'".<sup>4</sup> Proved classical references are very few indeed and are used in no way that is important to any argument. E. Howell finds two references only to the poets in Paul's Epistles (1 Cor.15:33; Tit.1:12) and two in the

1. G. La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire", H.T.R., 20 (1927), 370, mentions Roman Jews on the stage which is an interesting example of cultural accommodation. L. Sowden speaks of Jews on the stage and in the auditorium in the time of Nero.

2. *op. cit.*, 15, Col.1050.

3. We shall leave the question of Paul's acquaintance with Greek culture and the proportions between his debt to Judaism and to the Greek world until later.

4. Arndt-Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p.354. cf. J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, "The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament", 1930, p.285; C.K. Barrett, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians", 1968, p.110.

speeches attributed to him in Acts (Ac.9:5; 17:28). He sees possible echoes of the dramatists in a few places but he labours at the task of establishing connections.<sup>1.</sup> Perhaps the obscurity of the dramatic form of 7:7ff which has in our view prevented its general recognition, is connected not only with a certain lack of expertise in the execution, but also with a reluctance on Paul's part to identify himself too obviously with an art form which was alien to his religious heritage. If he does not do it brilliantly it is most remarkable that he does it at all. Can it be that the Epistle's destination in the capital of the empire loosened his inhibitions just a little?

Perhaps the nearest we can get to this form of expression in Paul is his frequent use of metaphor<sup>2.</sup> and also his adoption of apocalyptic images from the rich stock in Judaism. These latter comprise pictures in the mind rather than spectacles on the stage. Is there some remote connection between the concentration on the apocalyptic mode of thought in Judaism and the rejection of the drama, in that when one avenue of expression is blocked emphasis comes to be placed on alternatives?

---

1. "St. Paul and the Greek World", Expository Times, 71 (1960), 328-332. S. Cave's reservation, op. cit., p.21, that the absence of classical quotations in Paul's Epistles is not in itself conclusive that he was ignorant of such and that the nature of the Epistles do not lend itself to their use, is reasonable. H.J. Schoeps, "Paul", 1961, p.49, describes Paul as a city intellectual who uses images from the theatre among other sources, but he does not enlarge.

2. cf. W. Quanbeck, "Theological Reorientation", Interpretation, 14 (1960), 271; A.M. Hunter, "Teaching and Preaching the New Testament", 1963, pp.76ff.

In other words have we here an instance of cultural displacement? In any case Paul did not really require the devices provided by the drama. He had categories ready to hand and in profusion in the history of the people of God. Who needs to embark on flights of fancy when there are in abundance stories and incidents, rituals and characters from the past? It might be interesting to consider whether the converse applies. Is the abandonment of biblical categories and modes accompanied by an increase of interest in the drama?

In spite of the alien nature of the drama to the Hebrew ethos, two factors help us to understand why Paul should have recourse to the dramatic portrayal of 7:7ff. The first lies in his theological outlook and the second in his own personality.

H. Wheeler Robinson exposed a rich vein which scholars have mined with profit, when he laid bare that aspect of Old Testament thought for which he coined the phrase "corporate personality".<sup>1</sup> In its relation

---

1. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality", Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, 1936, pp.49-62. This aspect of O.T. thought was not unknown before, (Robinson refers to W.R. Smith, "Lectures on the Religion of the Semites", 1927, p.41), but H.W. Robinson's article was a significant point of departure. He identifies some main aspects of the concept: a. the unity constituted by its extension into the past and the future; b. the characteristic "realism" which distinguishes it from personification and makes the group a real entity actualised in its members; c. the fluidity of reference whereby thought oscillates from the one to the many and vice versa without notice given; d. its maintenance even after the development of an individualistic emphasis within it. Robinson also indicates three important applications of the concept: a. the representation of the nation by outstanding figures; b. the "I" of the Psalms and the Servant in Isaiah; c. the relation of members of the group to one another. cf. also H.W. Robinson, "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament", 1946, pp.70f, 81ff and "The Characteristic Doctrines", Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, 1938, pp.332f.



to Pauline theology the concept has been studied in depth by R.P. Shedd.<sup>1</sup> We instance a few of the numerous statements made by him which provide material for our argument. "The unity of all mankind is a presupposition transferred without challenge from Judaism and the Old Testament into the theology of the Epistles of Paul."<sup>2</sup> "It is with the Church, the New Humanity, created and constituted through solidarity with Jesus the Messiah that the theology of Paul is primarily concerned."<sup>3</sup> "The Israelite thinks in universals rather than atomistically....."<sup>4</sup> Shedd identifies "oscillation" between the individual and the group, the one and the many, as a characteristic of the Hebrew thought process.<sup>5</sup> He uses the phrase "continuous contemporaneity" to emphasise the connection of a generation with the past and with the future.<sup>6</sup>

Shedd affirms that the fact of Israel's unity is often expressed through the medium of analogy. "An almost innumerable series of metaphors and similes represent Israel throughout the Talmud and Midrash."<sup>7</sup> We think

---

1. "Man in Community", A study of St. Paul's Application of Old and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity, 1958.

2. *ibid.* p.97.

3. *ibid.* p.126.

4. *ibid.* p.27.

5. *ibid.* pp.38f.

6. *ibid.* p.56.

7. *ibid.* p.45.

that when Paul contrived his sustained figure in 7:7-25 he was exhibiting this same habit of mind. The corporate personality concept was part of the furnishing of his mind.<sup>1</sup> It is the theological presupposition of the literary form in question,<sup>2</sup> or we can turn the proposition round and say that this literary device enables large issues to be handled easily and neatly - in the right and skilled hands.

The personality trait in Paul which helps to render the unusual form understandable is his adaptability on which so many writers comment although all do not evaluate it in the same way.<sup>3</sup> We hold that this

1. On the importance of the corporate personality concept in Paul see: W. Wrede, *op. cit.*, pp.81f; E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, p.136; C.A. Anderson Scott, *op. cit.*, pp.155f; F.F. Bruce, *op. cit.*, p.126; T.W. Manson, "Ethics and the Gospel", 1960, pp.16f; W.D. Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", 1955, pp.101, 268. The concept underlies the considerable use J. Munck makes of the representative function, eg. "Christ and Israel", 1967, pp.98ff and "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.278. H. Wheeler Robinson, *op. cit.*, p.57, quoting from Mowinkel and in relation to the "I" of the O.T. Psalms, provides the very suggestive statement, "the community is 'the great ego'".

2. The doctrine of the "Two Impulses" is likewise part of Paul's stock-in-trade. We think that the crucial importance of Paul's Christological reassessment of the law would suggest caution in assuming too direct a dependence on the rabbinic doctrine in the portrayal of 7:7ff. Moral tension is a universal experience however it may be described. The corporate personality doctrine is not as common coin, although known outside Israel.

3. J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, pp.429, 591, deprecates the quality - "a thoroughgoing opportunist", "a clever politician". W. Wrede, *op. cit.*, p.35 speaks of Paul's pliancy. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, 1, pp.416ff, writes of Paul's versatility in the Epistles. C.H. Dodd's essay "Ἐννομεῖς Χριστοῦ", *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis Zwaan*, edd. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, 1953, pp.135ff, studies the principle of adaptability in Paul's missionary attitudes as enunciated in 1 Cor.9:19-22. G.B. Caird, *op. cit.*, p.102, calls Paul an opportunist in missionary method. cf. also M. Dibelius (ed. W.G. Kümmel), "Paul", 1953, pp.44f.

inventive component in Paul's make-up made it possible for him to attempt just one<sup>c</sup> this literary innovation. The form may have been alien to his culture but it was not impossible for his mind.

The Multiple Use of  $\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in 7:7-25.

Before we leave consideration of the form of 7:7-25 and turn to an analysis of the structure, we must emphasise that our understanding of  $\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in the passage must not be too narrow. An insight into the dramatic form of presentation as well as the exegesis itself rescues us from the error of defining the  $\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in too precise a fashion. The law is a character playing a role in a drama. This character is a cipher, a symbol, a representative term. We should not ask too closely concerning the clothes the character wears. It is the role played and not the clothes worn that matters. We have to adopt, or rather we have to recognise, a multiple interpretation of  $\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ . If there are rough edges and blurred dividing lines in the picture which we draw this is quite acceptable and indeed is exactly what we should expect on account of the chosen literary form. It only signifies the form of presentation and the limits which this imposes. We cannot look for the precision of a textbook devoted to exact descriptions.

We must look in four directions in order to do justice to the use of  $\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in the dramatic interlude of 7:7-25.

1. The Mosaic Law is in view. This is axiomatic. The writer is Paul once separated to the Law, now separated to the Gospel. He is writing to a Church which includes Jewish Christians, perhaps in the majority.

Prior reference to the Law has been made in the Epistle. A history of strife lies behind him in which he faced Jews and Judaisers pleading for the Law instead of the Gospel or in addition to the Gospel.

2. The Genesis precept is in view. We have shown that we have found the cumulative evidence of a Genesis allusion compelling. This is so even without the essay of S. Lyonnet, whose argument has however strengthened the case.

3. In 7:21<sup>1</sup> νομος is used in the sense of "principle" or "rule".

1. In patristic times the reference in τοῦ νομοῦ in v21 was assumed to be to the Mosaic Law and the consequent difficulty was felt from an early date, on which see the excellent note of E.H. Gifford, "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans", 1886, p.145. We adopt the figurative sense here. cf. Arndt.-Gingrich, p.544: "a rule governing one's actions, a principle or norm"; so also W.G. Kümmel; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam; J.B. Lightfoot - "the law of my being"; O. Kuss; O. Michel; A. van Dülmen, "Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus", 1968, p.115; H. Kleinknecht and W. Gutbrod, "Law", 1962, p.105; F.J. Leenhardt; K.E. Kirk; A.M. Hunter; C.E.B. Cranfield; F.F. Bruce; N.E.B., The Jerusalem Bible; R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.259, etc. In 3:21-23 νομος is used in both senses, Mosaic Law and Principle; cf. 7:23 and 7:25 where it is defined by the genitivus auctoris; also 8:2. J. Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", E.G.T., 2, p.642, finds a reference to the Mosaic Law in 7:21, as also do A. Schlatter, T. Zahn, K. Barth, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1933, p.266. Denney argues that a). "principle" is too modern - but then Paul did not have our sophisticated vocabulary at his disposal (cf. C.E.B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law", S.J.T., 17 (1964), p.55). If a wide variety of terms is not available the only course is to use existing terms with multiple meanings. Elaboration of terminology comes later. Denney's comment on v22, "Here also νομος is not used in the modern, physical sense but imaginatively", shows that he leans to the view which he rejects. b). ὁ νομος in Paul is always connected with legislative authority - but we can allow for this. "Principle" includes an element of authority. It is a statement of what is seen to happen. It holds good invariably and so there is an element of necessity in it. This view is supported by the fact that v21 is a summary of the preceding in which the "I"'s lack of freedom has been emphasised. c). The εἰ clause does not explain νομον and so Denney reads "This is what I find the law - or life under the law - to come to in experience: when I wish to do good, evil is present with me". But this is not the only possible explanation. It suits just as well to

This is also the case in v23.<sup>1.</sup>

4. An extension is required which will widen the application of νομος. If we fail to make this extension and interpret νομος too rigidly, we simply find ourselves having to make reservations and exceptions. Thus C.K. Barrett<sup>2.</sup> speaks of the primary concern of the passage as "the meaning of law and religion". He says<sup>3.</sup> it accounts for "the role of religion in man's experience". He also treats νομος<sup>4.</sup> as a paraphrase or shorthand for the Old Testament religion and hence for all religion.

(cont'd) take the ὅτι clause as defining τὸν νόμον. It is anticipated by τῷ θελόντι ἐμοὶ ποιῆναι τὸ καλόν, which points to the dative of the second ἐμοὶ for emphasis. (so O. Kuss, O. Michel, W. Gutbrod, A. van Dülmen; against J. Murray.) This is preferable to taking τῷ θελόντι ἐμοὶ with ἐνρίκνω τὸν νόμον as a dativus incommodi. We add that we have to work from the actual text before us and should only assume that it is "equivalent to" something else as a last resort. There is no need to do so here, C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.149 (cf. p.83 on 3:27) suggests that "principle" is "too philosophical" and, basing on 3:27, he takes νομος as "religious system" which seems very inappropriate in the case of 7:21. His phrase "law-like rule" (p.149), also appears suspiciously like "principle" as we understand it. Our view is confirmed by v22 where τῷ νόμῳ is qualified by τῷ θεῷ, which has to be added in order to differentiate νομος from its use in v21.

1. In ἐτέρον νόμον, v23, we have the figurative use once more. It is a law like the law of God because it imposes an absolute claim. But it is a different law because in it the "I" is addressed by a different authority, not by God but by sin. The fact that νομος can be used in this figurative way derives from the primary use of νομος with reference to God. It is "eine Entartung des wahren Gesetzes", (O. Michel, op. cit., p.179). H. Lietzmann, ad.loc., says that it equals "Willensrichtung".

2. op. cit., pp.152, 140.

3. ibid. p.153. We note the term "role".

4. ibid. p.140.



R. Bultmann<sup>1</sup> in similar fashion makes use of the phrase "the claim of God" in response to which man finds his "real self". F.J. Leenhardt<sup>2</sup> makes the extension thus: ".... any man face to face with any law, i.e. any man entangled in the situation of the legalist and claiming to obtain through good works the favour of God". C.L. Mitton<sup>3</sup> can speak of "any morally earnest man". O. Michel<sup>4</sup> appreciates that if the exegetical starting point lies in the Genesis story then the Mosaic Law would ultimately be no different from the natural law given also to the Gentiles as a "creation norm". We like the comments of M.-J. Lagrange in his Commentary, on 7:7ff, for this very reason that he grasps clearly the multiple reference of νομος , so that for him it is the Decalogue and Genesis and all positive, Divine commandment.

---

1. Bultmann employs the concept of the real man, otherwise the real self, will, existence, nature, life. Selfhood belongs to the nature of man so that being man means being a specific self which is the subject of its own willing and doing. Human existence consists in having a relationship to oneself. The real self is the self which has become objectivised in relation to himself. But man tries to attain selfhood self-reliantly out of his own strength. In fact however he only finds his real self when he surrenders to God's claim. It is one and the same thing to know his real nature and to be determined by the claim of God. The real man knows that the law is given for life. He wills the good and agrees with and delights in the law. A perversion of the self results through a false will towards selfhood. The "I" is not only weak, as Kümmel stresses, it is also deluded. (We have noted that Kümmel fails to elaborate the deception of will and that Bornkamm makes the point forcibly.) A split develops. The "I" and the "I", the self and the self, is divided. Human existence is a dichotomy. Man destroys his true self. Sin becomes the active subject within him. He dies, that is, he loses his self.

2. op. cit., p.196.

3. op. cit., p.133.

4. op. cit., p.185.



In Romans 2:14f the law of the Gentiles has already opened the door to an extension of νόμος beyond the Mosaic. In 1:18 - 3:20 all men are regarded as being in the same condition and are aware of the fact although in differing degree but always through the νόμος. In 7:1 the reference is not to Roman or Jewish law in particular but to law as a principle.<sup>1</sup> We have already pointed out that the Law of Moses is itself part of a process, a terminus ad quem and not only a terminus a quo.<sup>2</sup> We should also remember that the Law of Moses is wider than the Ten Words. It has ceremonial and judicial as well as moral content, in fact it stands for the total requirement in response to the Divine self-revelation.<sup>3</sup>

The definition of νόμος is important not only for exegesis but for its implications for the identity of the "I". If we restrict the reference to the Ten Words then the "I" will be a Jew. If the reference is wider then the "I" must be located more broadly. If the νόμος includes Exodus and Genesis and the absolute claim of God, then the "I" must be given the widest reference. The dramatic presentation is most admirably suited for just such a wide understanding. νόμος is portrayed as a character in the drama and must therefore be understood from a broad base.

1. cf. P. Benoit, op. cit., p.502, "l'exemple profane de VII, 1-3".

2. cf. R. Longenecker, op. cit., p.94 n25, in which he quotes from G.F. Moore, "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era", I, pp.262-277.

3. On Paul's use of νόμος in general, see especially E. de W. Burton, "The Epistle to the Galatians", 1920, pp.447ff.

We submit then, that in terms of literary form, 7:7-25 is an explicit dramatisation in which a theological argument is presented regarding the nature and function of the law, an argument which is integral to the content of the Epistle and which reflects an important aspect of the historical situation of the Church and of the writer. We have sought to show that hints of a recognition of this form, and in a few instances only more than hints, are to be found in the literature. While there is a proper element of surprise in this recognition which is explained by the inhibitions of Paul's Hebrew outlook, there are also balancing factors in his theological presuppositions and in his personal endowment.

THE LITERARY STRUCTURE OF 7:7-25.CHAPTER 7.

If we are correct in our identification of the literary form of 7:7-25 as a dramatisation, it must be possible to analyse the structure of the passage in a way that demonstrates the validity of our claim. We shall now attempt to do this. We find that the passage falls into five clearly defined parts.

1. In vv7-11 we have Scene One. In order of appearance we meet the law, sin and the "I". The substance of the message is the relation of the law and sin over against the "I".

2. In vv12-13 we have Scene Two. In order of appearance we meet the law, death, the "I" and sin. The substance of the message is the relation of law and death over against the "I" interpreted in terms of sin.

3. In vv14-24 we have Scene Three. This presents the fundamental conflict which characterises the relationship between the law and sin as this is manifested in the "I". The role which the "I" plays is determined strictly by this conflict. Law and sin together determine the "I". It is very important to note that law and sin appear in vv14ff in a different fashion from their previous appearance. They do not face one another on the stage as in the first two scenes but are drawn into, interiorised in, internalised in the "I". The "I" proceeds now in what we call a soliloquy. What was worked out in the first two scenes as a face to face encounter is now further expounded in a monologue which takes place within the "I".

4. In v25a we have Scene Four. A new character makes but a brief appearance, the "deus ex machina" as it were. The "I" is no longer the leading character as in Scene Three but is set over against this other. The message on this occasion is only hinted at. It will be developed in Chapter 8 in a form other than the dramatic.

5. When we come to v25b the dramatic presentation is ended. The message of the drama is summed up ( <sup>21</sup> απε <sup>22</sup> οὐ ) in a concluding antithesis, an epilogue as it were, which stands outside the dramatisation proper.

Our exegetical interest at this point lies towards the dramatic structure but first we affirm the general principle of the priority of exegesis<sup>1</sup> in the interpretation of 7:7-25. By exegesis we mean that we first consider each scene<sup>2</sup> from within itself and then in relation to the other scenes which means the context of the whole passage. We also bear in mind the immediate connections which are, as we have seen, 7:1-6 and 8:1ff. We also hold the passage within its wider context which is Chapters 6-8<sup>3</sup> although even this is only approximate, so close-knit is the argument of Romans. Chapter 5 connects very closely with Chapter 6 and also with

1. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.123; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.140; E. Ellwein, op. cit., p.266; O. Michel, op. cit., p.171; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.181 n2 observes that it is dogmatists rather than exegetes who refer Rom. 7:7ff to the Christian experience of Paul. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.87, asserts that we must speak from the text rather than about it: "So exegesis here must to a large extent be simply a paraphrase, a descriptive translation".

2. We use the word "scene" to indicate the constituent parts of the drama. A capital letter will be used only when a particular scene is in view.

3. It is significant that Kümmel, Bultmann, Bornkamm and H. Braun all begin their important essays on 7:7-25 by locating the passage within its epistolary context.

3:21-31 out of which arises the intervening Chapter 4. Then of course the preface 1:1-17 intimates the general theme.<sup>1</sup> The section 1:18 - 3:20 is related to what precedes and to what follows as the bad news to the good news. Chapters 9-11 deal at length and with passion with the place of the Jews in the saving purpose of God. The paraenetic section which begins at 12:1 gives the ethical inferences of the preceding Chapters. The more we study the Epistle the clearer becomes the unity of the whole. Only when the above requirements have been met do we look elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, the Pauline antecedents and the contemporary world of Paul.

We will now consider more carefully each of the five parts which we have identified.

#### 1. Scene One. vv7-11.

In the first scene we meet the three characters law, sin and the "I". The substance of the message of this scene is the relation between law and sin over against the "I". The formula<sup>2</sup> τὸ ὅτι ἐπορεύην indicates

1. Especially v3 and v5, "it is about His Son .... it is about Jesus Christ our Lord" (N.E.B.); also vv.16f. which serve as the "text" of the Epistle.

2. "The formula of transition" (B.F. Westcott, "St. Paul and Justification", 1913, p.269); "the formula of objection" (W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.123 "mit der Einwandsformel"). The resemblance to the style of the Diatribe is often noted. The Diatribe as such however is not the source of Paul's style which is parallel to rather than derived from it. The Epistle and the Diatribe share a common source which is the practical experience of public address and debate. The cut and thrust of argument produces this particular dialectical-literary form in the Cynic-Stoic philosopher, the missionary preacher and the modern debater. The stereotype appears wherever the situation recurs. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.43 relates some of Romans to Paul's debates in synagogue and market-place. The negatory formula μη γένοιτα, found in Romans more than in other Pauline Epistles (cf. 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; elsewhere 1 Cor. 6:15; Gal. 2:17; 3:21 and cf. 6:14), likewise reflects the dialectical situation.

a new stage in the argument. Paul brings into the open an obvious objection which could be inferred from previous incidental references to the law. We have argued that law must be understood here in a comprehensive sense as Mosaic Law, Genesis precept and the absolute claim of God. The dramatic form is ideally suited for this broad understanding. It limits the questions which we may sensibly ask and warns us against demanding too precise definitions. The question at stake in this scene is the nature of the connection which does certainly exist<sup>1</sup> between law and sin. Paul tries to clarify and elaborate this connection. The characters serve this purpose. The "I" is introduced as a means to this end and not as an end in itself so that the chief interest in the scene, as in the whole passage, is not the identity of the "I" but clarification of the relationship between law and sin which is expressed through the "I"'s encounter with law and sin.

We understand ἐγὼ<sup>2</sup> in v7 to imply both a theoretical and a practical knowledge of sin.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis is on the practical but the

---

1. 2M<sup>1</sup> v7, expresses a concession (so J. Denney, H. Lietzmann, W.G. Kümmel, O. Michel, O. Kuss, A. van Dülman) to the emphatic denial. The inference rejected is false but a matter of fact underlies it which Paul will elicit and reinterpret. The structure of v7 is: v7a in its three parts poses the question and gives the denial; v7b qualifies in that it extracts the element of truth which underlies the false inference that the law is sin and reshapes the conclusion in a way that retains a relation between law and sin but of a different kind; v7c (and v8a) resumes this conclusion and deepens our understanding by relating ἐπινομία to ἀναμία and by amplifying the reference to νόμος.

2. We have here a hypothetical statement with ἄν<sup>2</sup> omitted. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.46; Blass-Debrunner-Funk op. cit., para. 360, l. The context encourages us away from the indicative towards the hypothetical.



other cannot be excluded. R. Bultmann,<sup>1.</sup> here as at 3:20, understands practical experience only. H.J. Schoeps<sup>2.</sup> sees the Jewish idea of the ability to judge sin by the Torah. But this does not come from nor is it necessary to the context. In 2 Cor. 5:21 the reference must be to the practical knowledge of sin.<sup>3.</sup>

The emphasis in v8 is on ἁμαρτία which is the villain in the tale or rather the plot. It is more than a "blind negative bias"<sup>4.</sup> or an objective principle. Paul is personifying sin as a power which rules man.<sup>5.</sup> It is an enemy, as the military figure suggests, who seizes the commandment for its own purposes. It is more accurate here to describe sin as a power which has man in its grasp than as a weakness or disease in man. The emphasis is on man "under" sin, not on sin "in" man. Man is controlled from beyond himself rather than flawed within himself, although this too could be asserted in a different context. Sin belongs to man's

1. "Theology of the New Testament", 1, pp.264f, cf. T.D.N.T., 1, p.703: "the practical sense of familiarity is what is primarily meant in R.7:7..."; also G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.102 n5; O. Michel, op. cit., p.172.

2. "Paul", 1961, pp.175, 191.

3. In support of a practical knowledge and conscious awareness of sin cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.45, 49; P. Bläser, op. cit., p.125; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.142; O. Kuss, op. cit., p.442; A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.107; J. Murray, op. cit., p.249; A.J. Bandstra, "The Law and the Elements of the World", 1964, pp.126, 137. P. Benoit prefers "intellectual understanding" because practical knowledge sacrifices too much to the view that the text describes an experience. The change from ἐν to ὑπὸ prevents tedious repetition and there is no change in meaning.

4. H.C.G. Moule, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans", 1903, p.128.

5. cf. K.G. Kuhn, "New Light .....", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, 1958, pp.96ff, 104ff, on the "pattern of the two powers" which he says derives from Judaism and determines the logic of Rom. 6 and 7.

existence and not only to his will.<sup>1.</sup> This is an important lesson to be learned from 7:7ff. If we express this in terms of guilt then we must speak first of objective guilt and then of subjective.<sup>2.</sup> When we grasp this use of ἀμαρτία we are less inclined to see a description of a psychological process in these verses. Sin is an actor playing a major role in a drama. The difficult question of the origin of sin is quite out of view here.<sup>3.</sup> We can build towards it as a philosophical exercise but it does not lie within the scope of the passage. The dramatic form again limits the questions we are allowed to ask. The dramatic form also requires that we do not press the question of how sin uses the ἐντολή as an ἀφορμή in psychological terms.

ἀμαρτία νεκρά means that sin was inactive. It was "without the activity corresponding to it",<sup>4.</sup> "Sans force",<sup>5.</sup> powerless. νεκρά does

1. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.50, (cf. p.54), lists with approval authorities who see in ἀμαρτία a demonic being which brings man into subjection to himself. We do not think there is any demonology here but instead a dramatisation in which sin is represented "as if...." cf. E. Käsemann, "Perspectives on Paul", 1971, p.26, who writes of the demonic sphere in relation to the flesh as a "power". G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.91, understands a "mythological way of speaking" in which two subjects, sin and the "I", confront one another. cf. H.J. Schoeps, op. cit., p.184: "The struggle, which Paul depicts in semi-mythological terms...."; E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, p.358, speaks of "demonic counterpressure"; P. Tillich, "The Eternal Now", 1963, p.41: "Paul seldom speaks of sins, but he often speaks of Sin - Sin in the singular with a capital 'S', Sin as a power that controls worlds and mind, persons and nations".

2. cf. J.G. McKenzie, "Guilt: Its Meaning and Significance", 1962, pp.128f.

3. cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.91; A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.109 n120; R. Bultmann's venture into this profound issue (Theology of the New Testament, 1, pp.245f, cf. p.269) is not exegetical but is made in terms of his philosophical concept of "selfhood".

4. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.49. cf. 6:11, νεκρὸς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ meaning "no longer active in favour of sin".

5. M.-J. Lagrange, "Épître aux Romains", 1950, p.169.

not mean non-existent. The problem of how sin can be present Χρῆσις  
νόμου <sup>1.</sup> does not arise at this point. In fact Paul does not pronounce on  
 this issue anywhere in his Epistles. <sup>2.</sup> When we grasp the dramatic form we  
 are safeguarded from asking such irrelevant questions. The characters are  
 on the stage. That is sufficient. We do not ask "whence does he come?"  
 His presence is the given starting point. We feel that the study of  
 Romans 7:7ff has often been prejudiced by the failure to recognise the  
 limitations imposed on interpretation by an appreciation of the chosen  
 dramatic form.

In v9 the assertions of vv7f regarding the relationship of law and  
 sin are developed. The statement ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξ ὧν Χρῆσις νόμου ποτε is  
 important for our understanding of the ἐγὼ and shows clearly the problems  
 involved. We reject any reference to Paul's own childhood or youth based  
 on ποτε and for the following reasons.

1. It is difficult to give the hypothesis definite content. We find  
 ourselves becoming engaged in a guessing game. Was it at age seven, or age  
 ten, or age thirteen? Or perhaps it was an undefined age which varies in  
 different people? The formal bar mitzvah concept does not apply here. It

1. Χρῆσις νόμου : we are on common ground in 7:8; 5:13; 4:15 and 1 Cor.  
 15:56. In 7:8 "without law" there is no ἀφορμή for already existing sin  
 which is inactive. In 5:13 there is no reckoning (i.e. placing to one's  
 account of guilt, cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.50) of sin which nevertheless  
 exists in the absence of law. In 4:15 there is no παράβησις where there is  
 no law, that is, no conscious violation of a known commandment. In 1 Cor.  
 15:56 we have the same thing expressed positively. The σύννομος of sin is  
 the law. In 1:16 σύννομος is applied to the Gospel. We could substitute  
ἀφορμή for σύννομος without any shift of meaning. cf. also Gal. 3:19.

2. A. Sabatier, "The Apostle Paul", 1891, p.290 nl: "Paul nowhere expressly  
 speaks of the origin of evil; perhaps he never even considered this meta-  
 :physical question". cf. W. Wrede, op. cit., p.94; H. Wheeler Robinson,  
 "The Christian Doctrine of Man", 1926, p.118 nl. R.P. Shedd, op. cit.,  
 pp.78-87 reviews the search for the origin of sin in Judaism.

belongs to a much later period.<sup>1.</sup>

2. In fact the child is never completely without law in some shape or form. This is true generally but even more so in the case of the Jew and the Pharisee family in particular.<sup>2.</sup>

3. The picture of children as happy innocents is a romantic fiction. So also is the idea of the undeveloped society existing blissfully in primal state without law.<sup>3.</sup>

4. In his Epistles Paul speaks very seldom of his youth. The important passage Phil. 3:6f, shows pride not remorse when he so reminisces. The law is described there as καρσὴ.<sup>4.</sup> The emphasis in Gal. 1:14 is likewise on zeal and not on guilt.

1. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.82f.

2. cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.93; H. Lietzmann, "An die Römer", 1928, pp.73f; P. Bläser, op. cit., p.117; R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.95.

3. cf. J. Denney, op. cit., p.640; K. Barth, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1933, pp.248f; A.M. Hunter, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1955, p.72.

4. In support of our position on Phil. 3:6-7 cf. R. Bultmann, "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961, p.115 and "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.266; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.181; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., pp.151f; E. Ellwein, op. cit., p.257; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.93; P. Benoit, op. cit., pp.503, 504 n4; A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., p.141 (cf. p.147); W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.155; E. Stauffer, op. cit., pp.358, 361f who makes a distinction between the standpoint of the Jew and the Christian as provisional and final respectively; J. Blank, op. cit., p.12. But see also C.L. Mitton, "Romans vii Reconsidered", Expository Times, 65 (1953-54), pp.100f; R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., pp.97, 116; P. Althaus, "Reply to A. Nygren", Theologische Literaturzeitung, 8 (1958), Col.'s 480-1. For Paul's own recollection of his Pharisaic days cf. Gal. 1:13f; 1 Cor. 15:9; Rom. 11:1; 2 Cor. 11:22; see also Ac. 22:3; 26:5, and cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.111ff.

5. Paul is writing to a community in which he was not personally known, that is, known through personal visit. It is unlikely that he who was in normal literary circumstances reticent about his youth, would indulge in personal recollections on this particular occasion. It would at least be out of keeping with the general tenor of the Epistle.

In rejecting a personal reference here on the part of Paul, we turn away from a biographical and psychological interpretation of the passage.

The same reasoning applies to ἐξῶν<sup>1</sup> 1. for the meaning of which we must look in two directions. We look first to the immediate context. ἐξῶν both follows and balances νεκρά in v8 and anticipates ἀπέθανον in v10. Paul is thinking characteristically in antitheses: without law - under law; I lived - I died. It is the contrast that is important and the transition implied. A. van Dülmen<sup>2</sup> shows that with certain exceptions ζωή is normally found in an antithetical relation to θάνατος or some similar term such as ἀργή καὶ θμός, καταύριμα, φθορά, νεκρόν. In other words it is the antithesis which gives content to the term ζωή. We then look to the background of the passage in Gen.

3. Paul is theologising about a particular issue, namely, the relation

1. O. Kuss, op. cit., p.445, shows at length that ζωή is used by Paul in many shades of meaning: physical life; to lead one's life; to possess salvation; or as applied to Christ and to God. His conclusion is that nothing arises out of the usage which is decisive for ἐξῶν in v9. Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., pp.336f lists the uses of ζωή at length and takes 7:9 to refer to "the supernatural life of the child of God". But there is no discussion and the assumption is not defended.

2. op. cit., p.181 n62.

of law and sin with reference to the mythology of Genesis. 5:12-21 has already prepared the reader to think in salvation history terms. The "I" lived in the sense that the commandment has not yet sent forth its penal consequence of death.<sup>1</sup> It is life "before" the dominion of that death which is the work of sin which seizes opportunity through the commandment. "Life is that to which religion points, when it directs man to be content with the place in creation that God has accorded him".<sup>2</sup> The question "when" this life was, is as inadmissible as the question "when" did Adam live. Again the dramatic form forbids us from pursuing such questions.

An appreciation of the dramatic form also helps us to interpret the equation : "without law" is to life, as "under law" is to death. Law and sin are characters in the drama whose roles are enunciated over against the "I". Their roles control that of the "I". We learn how it is with the "I", only by observing the parts played by law and sin. This dramatisation enables Paul to theologise about the "timeless age"<sup>3</sup> which is no age on the time scale, yet to which all men belong. Because all belong there, as they also belong to Genesis 3, lines of communication can be drawn in many directions; to the Jews, to humanity as a whole, to Paul himself. Any one of these may be mistakenly adopted as the

1. of. E. Best, "The Letter of Paul to the Romans", 1967, p.82, "Death is both the result of sin (6:23) and its punishment (5:12-21 cf. Gen. 2:17)".

2. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.144.

3. K. Barth, op. cit., p.249.



exclusive interpretation. Hence the confusion sometimes encountered in the understanding of this passage and the variety of interpretations offered.

We must understand the "dying" in v10 in similar fashion. It is not a psychological event in which something dies "in" the "I". The death, like the life, is not located "within" the "I". The "I" lives or dies depending on its relation with God as that is determined by sin.

Paul has already spoken of death as the inevitable consequence of sin in the figure of the two masters in Chapter 6. The "wages" one receives is in the coin of the master whom one serves. We are dealing here with objective theology presented dramatically, not with subjective analysis employing introspection. The death means separation from God.<sup>1</sup> The sin which revives comes between the "I" and God. Genesis once more provides the background. In Genesis 2:17 (cf. 3:19) death is the threatened punishment for disobedience, and estrangement and exile are together the consequence of the primal sin. It is not simply physical death that is in view, although that is both part of it and a symbol of it. This present life apart from Christ is itself that death.

In v11 the dramatic figure continues. Sin is spoken of as deceiving and slaying the "I". R. Bultmann<sup>2</sup> says that ἁμαρτία appears

1. cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.124; O. Kuss, op. cit., p.445. P. Benoit, op. cit., pp.488f, gives a helpful note on the comprehensive use of θάνατος in Paul.

2. "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.245.

in vll as if it were a "personal being". W.G. Kummel<sup>1</sup> comments that its results characterise it as demonic. Sin shows its character as a "power" in what it produces, in its living quality, in its "capacity to induce disobedience".<sup>2</sup> Again we reject any psychological or autobiographical explanation of the deception. This is a theological argument using the dramatic form and influenced by the Genesis background.

The deception of sin consists in the false promise of life which it holds out to the "I". Two statements have already been made which help us to understand this. In v8 sin produces in the "I" every kind of ἐπιθυμία. The "I" is deceived into imagining that these desires will bring life. In fact they bring and can only bring death. The mistake lies in thinking that life can come from within, from the action of the "I", whereas in fact it can only come from without, from the action of God. This awareness erupts suddenly and briefly in Scene Four in positive terms. The very existence of covetousness therefore is evidence of the working of sin and of the deception of the "I" and of the inevitable destiny of death. In v10 the commandment was originally given with a view to life. The "I" is deceived in expecting the commandment to yield life. It cannot do so because of sin. The "I" does not encounter the commandment at first hand but only at second hand with sin coming between. The "I" does not deal with the commandment directly but with the

---

1. op. cit., p.54.

2. J.A.T. Robinson, "The Body", 1952, p.36.

commandment-in-the-hands-of-sin. Neither does the "I" encounter sin directly in which case its evil nature and fatal consequences would be clearly seen. It encounters sin-using-the-commandment. So sin thrusts forward the commandment and wreaks its havoc from behind this shield. The same principle is found in a different setting in 2 Cor. 11:14, where Satan is said to "masquerade" (N.E.B.) as an angel of light.

Another important assertion is thus made about the "I". It has its essence in deception.<sup>1</sup> No other existence is open to the "I". Sin and its forced accomplice, the commandment, constitute the "I" in deception. It must be understood clearly that God did not give the "I" this creation destiny. It became so inevitably when the "I" encountered the commandment-in-the-hands-of-sin. We repeat that the origin of sin is not in question here. The character is there on the stage. The limitations imposed by the form prevent us from asking where he came from. Sin is the villain. That is the message and that only.

We should note that the outcome is the same whether the law is appraised nomistically or anti-nomistically.<sup>2</sup> In the former case the "I"

1. cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp.91f. He brings out well that the essential and only life of the "I" lies in deception and death. Kümmel is weak in his assessment of this deception. He devotes surprisingly little consideration to ἐξομολογῆσαι αὐτῷ. His refusal to entertain a Genesis reference seems to inhibit him at this point.

2. The terms are Bornkamm's, op. cit., p.90. K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, pp.82f is very helpful here; cf. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.267. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., also makes formal use of these terms.

tries to win life by accomplishment.<sup>1.</sup> The end sought is thus thought to lie within his own ability. This is "the contempt of God's grace, the human effort to lay hands on that which God wants to be and to do for us, the endeavour to save, safeguard and exalt ourselves, while he wants to be our sole salvation, safeguard and exaltation. All that God has forbidden has been forbidden because in its origin and its essence it is this one forbidden thing, the act of our hatred of God's grace".<sup>2.</sup> This is deception, the fundamental misunderstanding of the true being of the "I". In fact, by which we mean as God knows it, "life" lies outside our circumference, above and beyond us in God. A straight line runs from this thought of deception to the concept of boasting as Paul uses it of which mention has already been made. Deception reveals itself in the object of one's boasting. Faith likewise reveals itself in the object of its boasting, which is God or Christ or the Cross or afflictions in as far as strength from above is manifested in them.

<sup>2</sup> ἄτεκτελνεν must be understood in line with <sup>2</sup> ἄτεθῶν and <sup>1</sup> θῶν in v10 and over against <sup>2</sup> ἐξω in v9. The emphasis is on the death rather than the life. This reflects the vigour of the role played by sin. The writer has control over his plot. He makes the terms mean what he wants them to mean in the interest of his message. Therefore we

1. cf. 10:3.

2. K. Barth, op. cit., p.83.

should not give <sup>21</sup>εἰς here the full meaning of eternal life as in the usual Pauline antithesis. Life and death are employed here in a theological discussion of the relation of man to God, as far as that is or is not determined by sin. The discussion is influenced by the Genesis drama and therefore is cast in dramatic form. The death is not a psychological phenomenon such as a feeling of despair or a premonition of doom or an awareness of a fatal consequence. It is a present reality, ontological not psychological. The "I" has its essence in death as well as in deception. The double statement that sin deceives and slays "uncovers the basis of my existence".<sup>1</sup> Sin thus belongs both to the existence and to the understanding of the "I". This death is the only life open to the "I" since the "I" has sought life in the wrong direction, in <sup>2</sup>ἐπιθυμία (v8), in accomplishment of its own (10:3). It is the one remaining alternative to the life which comes from without, from beyond, from above, that is, from God.

## 2. Scene Two. vv12-13.

We may regard v12 as the closing verse of the first scene in which case the first two scenes would comprise vv7-12 and v13. Each would then open with a rhetorical question answered by the emphatic ἔπειτα. The resemblance to the style of the Diatribe might be held to support this arrangement. It seems to suit the context better however

---

1. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.92.

to regard v12 as the opening verse<sup>1.</sup> of the scene. In either case <sup>cf</sup> 126TE ("accordingly") introduces the conclusion<sup>2.</sup> towards which Paul has been working in answer to the question with which v7 opens. v12 gives the conclusion of Paul's argument as this affects the law and indicates why the passage is rightly described as a defence of the law. It elaborates the conviction which underlies the emphatic denial of v7a. There is no question of a concession being made "in spite of" what has been said in vv7-11. The conclusion follows as a direct and necessary consequence of the argument which establishes that the νομος, understood in its comprehensive sense, belongs to the order of God.

The construction of v13 is complicated. In it Paul asks the question arising from v10 (and v11), "Does the law bring death?", as in v7 he has asked the question, "Is the law sin?". The answer is again a defence of the law the authority of which is preserved and any possibility that good can produce evil is discounted. The three characters who have appeared in the first scene - law, sin, the "I" - are presented again and are now joined by a fourth, death. The role of any one of these characters is not an independent one but is determined by the role of the others. Θεωσις here as in vv10-11, is again theological in meaning

1. This arrangement is evident in the paragraphing of the N.E.B., "The Jerusalem Bible", the version of J.B. Phillips and "Good News for Modern Man (Today's English Version)". R.S.V. begins the new paragraph with v13.

2. So O. Michel, op. cit., p.174; O. Kuss, op. cit., p.449; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.94; C.F.D. Moule, "An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek", 1959, p.144.



and not psychological.<sup>1.</sup> It is separation from God. Concerning the familiar Jewish practice of connecting sin and death, E. Best writes,<sup>2.</sup>

"The connexion between the death of men and the sin and death of Adam had already been taught among the Jews prior to Paul, but it does not appear in the Old Testament outside Gen. 3. The Old Testament was more concerned to emphasise the fact that men did sin than to explain why they sinned". The issue at stake in this scene is the connection between the law and death. Paul is caught with the paradox that law and death are somehow related. The "somehow" is the problem. He has to find a way of saying that the law is the occasion of sin without also having to say that it is the cause. He therefore adjusts the sequence to read sin-law-death, instead of a direct law-death. This adjustment is made by means of the technical device of the role-playing characters. Again we must beware of raising philosophical problems which are irrelevant to the text. The intention of the presentation is a limited one. It identifies sin as the basis of evil and therefore as the bringer of death. Thus it shifts the blame away from the law. We can of course discuss any philosophical problem we choose provided that we recognise the point at which we pass from exegesis of the actual text in its dramatic form to an abstraction which is not connected directly with the passage.

---

1. of. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.145: "It is to be noted that this verse betrays not the least interest in psychology...." He goes on to speak of "the doom of creation separated from the Creator".

2. "The Letter of Paul to the Romans", 1967, p.61.

The two almost identical <sup>cf</sup> ~~(vix)~~ clauses explain how sin can use the law and the explanation is given in functional or dramatic terms. The law has a role to play which is to reveal the true nature of sin. In contrast to sin which has a role as deceiver presenting the facts as they are not, the law has a role as revealer presenting the fact of sin as it is, which means as it is to God. This connection between the law and sin is not accidental but is of divine purpose. Sin reveals itself "offenbar nach göttlichem Ratschluss".<sup>1.</sup> The problem of how sin uses the law may be illumined by the Christological analogy from the Gospels, where (cf. Lk.11:37-54) a running fight is waged between Jesus and the Pharisees and Scribes. They regard Jesus as fundamentally irreligious in that he opposed their understanding and practice of religion and therefore as anti-God. He who was good was hailed as evil. The Son of God was crucified in the name of God. The Cross was engineered from religious motives, the political motives being secondary. In the case of the law "that which was good" was used for evil ends. As the hostile reaction to Jesus revealed the truth concerning the Pharisees and their religion so the use made of the law by sin reveals the true nature of sin.<sup>2.</sup> We cannot tell whether Paul was familiar with this Christological

---

1. O. Kuss, op. cit., p.450. cf. P. Bläser, op. cit., p.136: "...dieser Missbrauch des Gesetzes durch die Sünde war von Gott vorausgesehen und beabsichtigt....."

2. cf. 1 Cor. 2:8, "if they had (known) .... they would not have ...." (N.E.B.). The evil powers went beyond the point at which their interests were served and the issue turned against them.

analogy so applied, but he certainly did make a Christological critique of the law.

The matter is important and so the second <sup>ei</sup>iva clause intensifies the first.<sup>1</sup> It adds ἡ ἀμαρτία for clarity and makes a significant addition in the adverbial phrase καθ' ὑπερβολὴν.<sup>2</sup> Sin exceeds itself when it challenges God by perverting the law which is his good gift, but it cannot succeed because sin does not contend with God as an equal. God does not appear in this dramatisation as a character on equal footing with sin, law and death. The disconnection of the fourth scene emphasises this as we shall see. The law does two things: it helps sin to the detriment of man by providing an ἀφορμὴ; it also inflicts an injury on sin and thus fulfils its true destiny.<sup>3</sup> The latter function is the new thought. It gives the law an active and positive role as well as the more passive role of the first <sup>ei</sup>iva clause.<sup>4</sup> Again the Christological

1. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.57, sets out the text in a way which shows clearly the parallelism between the two clauses.

2. The phrase occurs five times in Paul and only in the "pillar" Epistles, here and 1 Cor.12:31; 2 Cor.1:8; 4:17; Gal.1:13. B.F. Westcott, "St. Paul and Justification", 1913, pp.273f, offers the salutary comment: "Every writer has favourite phrases, which vary at different times of his life. This is sometimes forgotten by persons who lay much stress on vocabulary, as a never-failing test of authenticity".

3. cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.57.

4. cf. E. Stauffer, T.D.N.T., 2, p.358: "The divine impulsion is turned into its opposite by demonic counterpressure. But everything enterprised against God finally destroys itself ...."

analogy is relevant. Jesus Christ gave himself to the use of sin without surrendering his prior right to use sin. As in his case life sprang from the dead by an act of God, so out of the condemnation and death effected by sin's use of the law, salvation comes by act of God.<sup>1</sup> We touch here what we understand to be Paul's fundamental attitude to the law. He makes a Christological critique of the law. He reinterprets it in the light of Christ's relation to sin and to the law, above all in his death. It is thus possible to regard sin in a way which does not make it independent of God. We may either say that sin is self-defeating which is another way of asserting the sovereignty of God, or we may say that the law which is used by sin is also itself used by God to contribute to the usurper's overthrow.

We offer two analogies to clarify the idea expressed in the rather clumsy conjunction of noun, adjective and adverbial phrase which represents sin as "exceeding itself",<sup>2</sup> recourse to analogy being a familiar way of elaborating what is difficult of expression. The first is from the movement of the ocean tides. Only when ebb or flow has reached its full movement in one direction does the opposite movement assert itself. So when sin reaches its extremity, which it does in the death of Christ,

---

1. of. K.E. Kirk, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1937, p.207: "O felix culpa!" A.R. Vidler, "Christ's Strange Work", 1963, p.48 writes, "But St. Ambrose is very bold and speaks of the Law not only as necessary, but as 'redeeming sin by sin'". ("Letters", 73,6; cf. 73,8.) of. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.268.

2. The N.E.B.'s translation of Romans 5 brings out very well the thought of the "excess" of grace over sin.

the conditions are set for its opposite. Slack water, the point of no further movement in one direction and the prelude to movement in the other, is the event of Christ, above all in his death. The second analogy comes from the Jungian doctrine of "opposites".<sup>1</sup> In the dynamics of the unconscious mind a flow of energy in one direction reaches a terminus and gives way to a flow of energy in the opposite direction, hence the violence of mood swings. So salvation begins at that point at which sin has reached its terminus which means ultimately the death of Christ and then (and only then) the opposite flow takes place.<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Scene Three.      vv14-24.

In the dramatic structure of the passage vv14-24 comprise a new scene, the third in the series. A different style or idiom is adopted in this scene from that of the two previous ones. We describe this as a soliloquy. In it one character previously in view, namely, the "I", interiorises within itself the roles formerly played by the other characters, law, sin and death.

1. of. F. Fordham, "An Introduction to Jung's Psychology", 1959, pp.17f.

2. of. A. van Dülmen, op. cit., p.207 (also p.201) where the assertion is made that unrighteousness and righteousness, sin and grace, death and life, are not mere opposites but stand in an inner relation to one another, so that the measure of the one side determines that of the other. Also cf. E. Stauffer's language (op. cit., p.358) of pressure and counterpressure in the progress of salvation history and also his "nadir" figure (p.359), which presumes a point after which an upward movement takes place. See also R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.268, on the controlling function of grace in the law.

The Continuity of vv14ff with vv7ff.

It is very important first of all to understand the continuity of vv14ff with vv7ff. G. Bornkamm<sup>1</sup> grasps this firmly when he says, "The connection between the two sections (7-13 and 14-25) cannot be over-emphasised. It is disastrous to connect the discussion of the anthropological problem of ch.7 essentially only to 7.14ff, as usually happens. In fact, 7.7-13 more than any other passage has already given the decisive answer to the question, who am I?" A. Nygren,<sup>2</sup> like Augustine before him after his change of mind regarding the interpretation of Romans 7,<sup>3</sup> makes a clear point of division at v14. He sees vv7-13 as the elaboration of v5 and relates them to the Christian's past. He takes vv14-25 as the amplification of v6 and relates them to the Christian's present. He claims that at v14 we step from the one condition to the other. We reject this view. It is quite wrong to begin the exegesis of vv14ff at v14. The previous sequence is in fact continued in vv14ff. The same "I", the same condition of the "I" and the same νομος are under discussion. The εγω of vv14ff is the same εγω which, in vv7-13,

---

1. op. cit., p.95. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.146, inserts an amplifying clause, "there is no question of the goodness of the law", before καρ to emphasise the connection with the preceding. Bengel and P. Althaus likewise stress the significance of the καρ. In support of the continuity of vv14ff with vv7ff cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.10, 57, 90, 125, 133; A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., pp.136, 145 n106a; P. Bläser, op. cit., p.118; E. Fuchs, "Die Freiheit des Glaubens", 1949, p.56; P. Benoit, op. cit., p.458.n2; R. Bultmann, "Römer 7 ....", p.205; P. Althaus, "Paulus und Luther Über den Menschen", 1963, pp.128-131; K. Kertelge, op. cit., p.108.

2. op. cit., p.277.

3. On which see W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.91ff.



has been identified as deceived and slain by sin using the law. This "I" and no other, this law given by God and usurped by sin and no other, this existence defined by delusion and death, is the continuing theme of vv14ff.

### 7:7-25 a Unity.

Vv 7:7-25 have a unity of their own although they are also closely connected with what precedes and with what follows. The fact that the passage is a self-contained digression wedged between 7:6 and 8:1 points to that unity. In terms of content the unity is given by the controlling purpose which is the elucidation of the nature and function of the law in the saving purpose of God. This purpose is sustained throughout. In terms of literary form, the dramatic presentation is the unifying framework. The scenes of the drama are intimately related though not of equal length and not identical in style. The device of the "I" which runs through the passage within the larger dramatic framework serves as a connecting-link to bind it together. It is the same "I" from start to finish and the same condition of the "I" is before us until the interrupting v25a which anticipates 8:1ff. The outward form thus helps to preserve the inward unity.

This unity is sometimes expressed by commentators as a tendency in the passage to work towards a climax. It builds up to a point which is variously identified as the cry of v24;<sup>1</sup> the anticipatory thanksgiving of

---

1. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.182 nl.

v25a which is worked out in 8:1ff; the emphatic assertion of 8:1;<sup>1.</sup>  
 the αὐτός ἐγώ of v25b as the culmination of the ἐγώ series;<sup>2.</sup> and  
 as the moment of mystical death.<sup>3.</sup>

W.G. Kummel<sup>4.</sup> interprets the change which is obvious at v14 as a displacement in the sequence of the argument which now moves into the foreground of thought and from v18 becomes a purpose-in-itself. In fact he claims that it takes over from the original purpose which is the defence of the law. The elucidation of the dichotomy becomes the chief interest. This is confirmed, Kummel maintains, by the design of the

1. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.100: "In fact, ch.7 as a whole presses forward to the one word that actually occurs in 8:1: 'condemnation'".

2. C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.135. cf. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.112.

3. J.A. Bengel, "Gnomon of the New Testament", ed. A.R. Fausset, 3,1862, pp.93, 96, (on vv15f). He sees, a dawning towards the light of day in which ἐσθλη, v16, and ἐσθλη, v22, anticipate v25a and Chapter 8. We on the contrary understand the climax as total despair. The positive axis in the thought, anticipated only v25a, is vertical and not horizontal. The man of v24 is an abandoned man (cf. παρὰ δὲ τοῦ 1:24, 26, 28) whereas the man of Chapter 8 (cf. 7:6 and 7:25a) is a rescued man.

4. op. cit., p.10. cf. A. van Dülmen, op. cit., p.112 and n126, who calls vv14-25 an appendix which clarifies the relation of law and sin in the history of salvation out of the inner condition of man. H. Braun, "Römer 7, 7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen", Z.Th.K., 56 (1959), p.17 (comparing Chapter 7 with the Qumran member who says both "yes" and "no" to the Torah), says that the split in Romans 7 becomes the central theme. K.E. Kirk, op. cit., p.208, describes vv17-20 as "a parenthesis on the lower self". F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.192, suggests that vv19f are possible glosses but there is no MSS. evidence whatever for this and the repetitive and complicated argument can be understood without any need for excision. The physician is called for rather than the surgeon.

Chapter's ending. This is not a final, positive assertion concerning the law as might have been expected but reaches its climax in the anguished question concerning the one who delivers from the conflict.

We agree with Kummel that there is a change in the passage and that vv14ff present features which require explanation. We disagree however with his way of resolving the problem. We submit that the answer lies in grasping the dramatic form within which there is not only a change of scene at v14 but also a change in the style or idiom of the scene. Whereas in the first two scenes the characters faced one another on the stage in dialogue, in vv14-25 the "I" internalises the other characters. It draws them into itself so that their roles are now played within the "I" and not over against the "I". The multilogue has become a monologue. There is no change in the theme although the change in idiom may mislead us into thinking that it is so. The over-all theme is still the defence of the law.

Why then does the famous conflict occupy so much space? Why is the third scene much longer than the first and very much longer than the fourth and last? The answer lies in two directions. First, we must remember that the author is master of his plot. No scene has to be short or long. The playwright makes it what he will in keeping with his purpose. The characters play the roles they are given and say what they are made to say. We must therefore allow for dramatic licence. Secondly, we must allow for the difficult and complicated nature of the argument. One way of tackling a difficult subject is to multiply explanations. This is what happens in vv14-24. What has already been said in vv14-17 is repeated in

vv18-20 in an effort at further clarification. V20 concludes the main argument. V21 then sums up the argument of vv14-20 in terms of the basic principle of the two opposing laws. Vv.22-23 go on to confirm and expand this summary but do so by replacing the previous controlling antithesis by sets of opposites which introduce a new terminology and thus complicate the matter. The difficulty of the theme does not allow progress to be made in a straight line, by the shortest route. The thought moves hither and thither, reflecting, clarifying, but in effect confusing. The logic of the drama is not necessarily the logic of rhetoric. Paul is not really at home with the dramatic form of presentation. He is not able to work out the plot simply and tidily. It is not that kind of subject. He is not that kind of writer. The final scene is very brief. He is glad to be quit of his troublesome creation. Enough is enough. The final summary (<sup>21</sup>~~απα~~  
<sup>3</sup>οὐκ - a sigh of relief?) lies outwith the dramatic figure and he returns to a form more suited to his liking and to his wont.

#### The Conflict in vv14ff.

We can appreciate better the difficulty facing Paul if we now look more closely at the famous conflict in vv14ff.<sup>1</sup> From the standpoint of the "I" itself we may use the more subjective term "conflict". From

---

1. The variety of English terms which are used to express this conflict shows how large it has loomed in the discussion: conflict, split, disruption, dichotomy, enigmatic contradiction, division, rent, tension, abyss, gulf, dissension, disunion, chasm, schism, rupture, discord, divorce, the contradictory being, the "double must" comprising the necessity imposed by sin and that imposed by God, cleft, antagonistic principles, double existence, incongruity, estrangement, cleavage, alienation.

the standpoint of the reader or onlooker we may use the more objective term "split" or "dichotomy". We must begin with the antithesis in v14.<sup>1</sup> This is a "programmatic statement"<sup>2</sup> in which the spiritual law and the unspiritual "I" are opposed. Vv.15ff show how what has been opposed works out in the "I" in a split or conflict which is looked at in this way and in that, as the "I" soliloquises in anguish until the culminating crie du coeur of v24. As in the first scene (vv7-11) and in the second scene (vv12-13) the defence of the law is expressed in the conclusion - not the law but sin, so in the third scene the defence of the law is expressed in the conclusion - not the "I" but sin. The split is evidence of the opposition of the "I" and sin, the same sin which already opposed the law, the same "I" which has confronted law and sin.

#### The Two Conflicts of vv7ff.

It is very important to recognise that in vv7ff we are dealing with two conflicts not one. These are related to each other in a special way. The first conflict may be described as altogether external to the "I". It has therefore to be stated in terms of objective theology. It is

1. P. Blaser, op. cit., p.123, asserts that the antithesis in v14 is the key which unlocks the passage. This is an oversimplification. The antithesis of v14, the principle of v20, the concluding summary of v25b, are all important. The key lies in the passage as a whole rather than in any one verse within it.

2. E. Kasemann, "Perspectives on Paul", 1971, p.1, applies the phrase "programmatic statement" to a proposition of Bultmann's. K. Stendahl, "Peake 1962", p.755, speaks of Luke's "programmatic sermon" in Lk.4:16-30. G. von Rad, "Genesis", 1961, p.47, describes Gen.1:1 in relation to 1:1 - 2:4 as "the summary statement". B. Reicke, "The Law and This World According to Paul", J.B.L., 70 (1951), p.271, calls Rom. 8:1 "the thematic introductory words to this Chapter".

not anthropological but "trans-subjective" or transcendent. These terms come from R. Bultmann<sup>1</sup> who has illumined the discussion by his insistence on the trans-subjective nature of the conflict. The "I" stands over against the transcendent realities, sin and death. How better to present this thought than to dramatise it? In terms of the dramatic figure the "I" plays its role in the drama over against the other actors whose roles together determine that of the "I". This objective or trans-subjective conflict is the theme of vv7-13, which show in two scenes how, with reference to the "I", law and sin are connected.

There is also however a second conflict which lies within the first. It may be described as subjective. It is internal to the "I".<sup>2</sup> The first conflict is the ground of the second. The second conflict is evidence of the first.

In order to understand the first, objective conflict more fully we may consider one member of that particular conflict. We therefore abstract the "I" from the total situation which comprises the "I" over against the transcendental realities which are sin and death. We then explore the "I". We examine the "I" from within itself as it were. This internal exploration of the "I" clarifies the objective relationship in which the "I" stands and so we understand the whole by the part. We

---

1. "Romer 7 ....", passim.

2. cf. W. Manson, "Jesus and the Christian", 1967, p.151, who says that vv14-24 deal with "the internal nature of the sinful situation".



emphasise that we are not abandoning the transcendent nature of the conflict. This remains as the presupposition. We are simply abstracting and examining one side (the "I") in order to understand the whole (the two sides in opposition) better.

We discover within that one side which is the "I" a profound, inward conflict or split, which so characterises the "I" that we have to say that the "I" is that split. "Der Mensch ist der Zwiespalt".<sup>1</sup> We have to say in apparent confusion that the "I" is against the "I". The "I"'s existence consists in this opposition. We must therefore think by means of paradox in order to resolve the problem. We find a further explanation for Paul's adoption of the dramatic form of presentation precisely in this need for paradoxical thinking. As in logic a paradox leaves us with unresolved tensions, so the dramatic portrayal makes possible the necessary assertions without raising or attempting to answer all possible questions.

This "conflict within a conflict" enables us to fix the frame of reference within which we must interpret the anthropological and psychological terms of vvl4ff. The passage is not a psychological treatise. C.H. Dodd's treatment of the passage<sup>2</sup> as a psychological description of moral perplexity is too psychological by far. It is on the contrary a

---

1. R. Bultmann, "Romer 7 ....", p.202. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.135ff.  
 O. Kuss, op. cit., p.458 says the "I" is a battlefield.

2. op. cit., ad loc. cf. H. Lietzmann, op. cit., p.73: "Es wird der psychologische Prozess der Entstehung der Einzelsünde im Menschen geschildert".

piece of brisk theological skirmishing presented in a particular way which we call the dramatic. The terms in vvl4ff are used within the larger context. They reflect the objective situation within which the subjective is lodged. It may well be of course that by a process of association the second, lesser, or subjective conflict acquires a kind of objectivity of its own but this is illusory. The second lies within the first and is controlled by it. The fact of the two conflicts and the relation between them is reflected in the changed idiom of Scene Three in which the "I" soliloquises in the terms already made familiar. New terms are however added to these with a confusing effect.

How are we to elucidate this second or subjective conflict? How else than by using terms already familiar and to hand, namely, the anthropological and psychological terminology of Paul's thought world. The question of first importance when we consider these terms is not their linguistic antecedents but the context in which they are employed<sup>1</sup>, which is constituted by the two conflicts. The vocabulary is conscripted to the service of Paul's immediate purpose within his chosen form of writing. It must be understood strictly by the frame of reference already established.

---

1. cf. C.C. McCown, "The Sources of Pauline Mysticism", Munera Studiosa, edd. M.H. Shepherd and S.E. Johnson, 1946, p.52: "The origin of an idea or a pattern of ideas does not necessarily determine its values"; and p.57: "No stigma should attach to borrowing; it is the use of the borrowed materials that counts". G. Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology", 1961, p.232 says regarding the eschatology of Judaism, "The origin of a scheme does not always coincide with the uses to which it may be subsequently put".

Some Inadequate Interpretations of the Conflict in vv14ff.

The two-fold nature of the conflict which lies within the dramatic form enables us to make certain important reservations regarding the nature and interpretation of the conflict.

1. We are not dealing here with a conflict in the Freudian sense which understands a clash between energies on the conscious and unconscious levels of the mind. The presuppositions of Romans 7:7ff are completely different. It is not that kind of conflict at all.

2. We are not involved in demonology. The "residence" metaphor of v17 may suggest affinities with the demon possession of the Gospels. This metaphor however, like those from slavery and from warfare, is located within the larger context and is subsidiary to it. An appreciation of the dramatic form of presentation allows us to do full justice to the vigour of the "residence" metaphor and to the dynamic quality of sin in the passage without entering into the philosophical implications of a demonic reference.

3. The conflict must not be construed in terms of Gnostic dualism as if the "I" had a higher part and a lower, a part which needs salvation and one which does not, a material part and a spiritual. The nature of the two conflicts and the dramatic form of the presentation safeguard us from assuming a dualistic anthropology. The distinctions within the "I" are differentiations in function which are represented dramatically as the characters play out their roles, first opposite one another and then within the "I".

4. The reference frequently made to classical authors<sup>1.</sup> as relevant parallels to the account of the conflict in Romans 7:7ff is far from adequate.<sup>2.</sup> As soon as we locate the conflict of vv15ff within the larger conflict as we have stated it, we are moving on a different plane from the psychological distress of the classical texts. We are dealing with a conflict which is ontological before it is psychological. This is a theological analysis presented dramatically and not an observation from universal moral experience. The classical authors lack the transcendent element which derives ultimately from the Apostle's understanding of the basic eschatological situation.

5. Romans 7:15ff must not be regarded as a set piece intended to portray the moral predicament of man. The conflict of vv15ff is subsidiary to the larger conflict. When the passage is quoted as a psychological vignette it is abstracted from its context and given a reference which was not in the author's intention. Homiletics must wait here on exegesis. We note K. Stendahl's article<sup>3.</sup> which takes issue with

1. Ovid, "Metamorphoses", 7.20f; Epictetus, "Dissertations", 2.26.4; Horace, "Epistles", 1.8.11; Euripides, "Medea", 1074. cf. Aristotle's use of ἀκραιβία as the second of the four possible stages in the moral history of a man.

2. This inadequacy is stressed by O. Michel, op. cit., pp.176f; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.147; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., pp.153f; W. Manson, op. cit., p.157. R. Bultmann, "Romer 7....", p.201, dismisses the Ovid quotation as a trivial insight ("zugunsten der billigen Einsicht...."). also cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.193 n2.

3. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", H.T.R., 56 (1963), 199-215.

the psychological view of 7:7ff. This contribution to the discussion of the dichotomy of vv15ff is useful in three directions.

a. Stendahl sketches the historical background of a mode of interpretation which he calls "Western" and "introspective". Its roots lie in Augustine whom he describes as the first modern man in that through his introspective writings in the "Confessions", we gain insight into his mind.<sup>1</sup> They then pass into mediaeval piety and come to full bloom in M. Luther who approaches Paul in general and Romans 7 in particular out of his own very special and yet representative position. The theological climax in Luther is paralleled by the secular climax in Freud. The introspective view is thus historically conditioned and does not represent accurately the actual context in which Paul wrote.

b. Stendahl denies that Paul was an introspective type and holds that he had on the contrary "a rather robust conscience" both before and after his conversion which was not a deliverance from a plagued conscience. His subsequent life was not harassed by a burdened conscience and he did not urge Jews to turn to Christ for relief from such. His most favoured term for salvation is not forgiveness. Paul has in fact been cast in an introspective mould by his interpreters who have projected on him their own viewpoint which is historically conditioned.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Stendahl overstates his case here. The poems of Catullus for instance are self-revelatory.

2. cf. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, pp.34f.

c. Stendahl claims that Paul's writings in general and Romans 7 in particular are historically conditioned. Two questions dominate Paul's thought concerning the law, by which he means the Mosaic Law. What happens to the Law now that Messiah has come? What place have the Gentiles in the saving purpose of God? In the course of time the Western introspective outlook asserted itself. The historical problems of conscience receded into the background and were replaced by those of the personal, individual conscience. Paul became what he was not, a "hero" of the introspective conscience". His Epistles were seen as "documents of human consciousness". In fact however, Stendahl affirms, Romans 7 is about the nature of man and sin.

In this essay we have a salutary warning against an easy assumption of a psychological interpretation of Romans 7. Stendahl's assessment of Luther's influence on interpretation is illuminating.<sup>1</sup> We think that the law has a wider reference than he allows, perhaps because he deals with it on too wide a canvas. We suspect that his case is over-stated but then this can be said of many, if not most, views of Paul. The affinity of his interpretation to that of W. Wrede<sup>2</sup> is obvious with its objective conception of redemption. The centre of gravity in Wrede is not located in the individual but in the deliverance of mankind from the evil powers which took place in the death and resurrection of Jesus. The concept of solidarity then leads to the participation of the believer

---

1. cf. W. Wrede, op. cit., pp.25, 131f; R. Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law", Essays: Philosophical and Theological, 1955, pp.37, 53.

2. "Paul", 1907. cf. H. Anderson, "The Historical Paul ", New College Bulletin, 4, (Spring 1968), 12ff.



in what Christ has done and the Spirit effects the reality which is both present and to come.

E Kasemann<sup>1</sup> makes a reply to Stendahl's essay and his location of Stendahl's standpoint within the history of theology is helpful. He argues that justification is a fundamental doctrine of Paul and not just a polemical incident which can later be dispensed with. Its true starting-point is not the individual but the objective fallen situation of man which is answered by a salvation which is both cosmic and eschatological. He insists that justification and salvation history must be held together and neither separated from the other nor set against the other. Salvation history is the sphere, that is, the "historical depth" and "cosmic breadth" of justification, while the latter is the centre, the beginning, the end of the former. Justification and the Kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus are about the same thing. When justification and salvation history are rightly co-ordinated Christ is established in his proper place and his cross is held central. We think that Kasemann's plea is correct. As so often in deciding Pauline issues, it is a case of maintaining a balance. The essays in question complement one another, each succeeding in making a valid point.

#### Guidelines for the Anthropology of vvl4ff.

Much of the difficulty in interpreting vvl4ff derives from the problems presented by its anthropology. The following principles sum up

---

1. "Perspectives on Paul", 1971, pp.60ff.

our approach to the anthropological terms in the passage.

1. The anthropological problem must be discussed in the light of the whole passage which is vv7-25 and not simply of vv15-20.

2. The controlling interest in the passage is the defence of the law. The anthropology is subsidiary to this interest.

3. The two conflicts, objective and subjective, fix the frame of reference within which we interpret the anthropological and psychological terms of vv14ff.

4. The problems in this anthropological adventure in vv22f arise because at this place Paul's anthropology is out of step, or out of synchronisation, with his theology. We may express the matter more adequately as an instance of "stimulus diffusion".<sup>1</sup>

5. Paul does not offer in his Epistles a strictly systematic anthropology.<sup>2</sup> This raises the large question, are we to regard Paul as a systematic theologian? We must give an ambivalent answer.<sup>3</sup> Paul has not

1. See below pp.222f.

2. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.138, (cf. p.26); H. Lietzmann, "An die Römer", 1928, p.73.

3. Among those who seem to hold a positive view of the issue are: W. Sanday, "Paul", A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, 1913, 2, p.886; A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.69; A.S. Peake, "The Quintessence of Paulinism", B.J.R.L., 4, (1917-18), pp.285ff; J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, pp.581f, 583, 585; R. Bultmann, "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961, p.120. C.H. Dodd, "According to the Scriptures", 1952, p.135, can speak of "his massive theology". Among those who seem to hold a negative view are: S. Cave, "The Gospel of St. Paul", 1928, pp.13-17; P.B. Minear, "The Obedience of Faith", 1971, p.33. An ambivalence is evident in many writers eg.: C.A. Anderson Scott, "Christianity According to St. Paul", 1932, p.2, (cf. pp.16f) says that Paul is a thinker but not a theologian in a technical sense. His concluding paragraph however, p.279, reads very strangely if we do not acknowledge Paul as in some sense a theologian. cf. C.K. Barrett,

produced a Church Dogmatic in which the comprehensive nature and inner coherence of the Christian belief are elaborated after the fashion of Aquinas, Calvin or Barth. Nor does he present philosophical theology in the manner of Temple or Tillich. The answer must therefore be in the negative. Yet this is not the whole story and more has to be said. We must indeed allow Paul something in the way of a systematic outlook. We find a tacit admission of the fact in some writers who make a formal denial of the possibility.<sup>1</sup> Their denial also, we note, is made within a long treatise representing many years of study.<sup>2</sup> A glance at the

(cont'd) "From First Adam to Last", 1968, p.3: "Paul was not a systematic theologian but he laid the foundations for systematic theology.." (and see also his "Christianity at Corinth", *B.J.R.L.*, 46 (1964), p.269); T.W. Manson, "On Paul and John", 1963, pp.11f. The frequent attempt to isolate a key category in Paul's thought is evidence of the widely held belief that it can be organised. The different answers however suggest that it is not obviously systematic. It is in other words a "yes" and "no" issue.

1. eg. W. Wrede denies that Paul is <sup>a</sup> systematic thinker but then has to qualify this view - cf. op. cit., pp.74, 171, 175 "He was the first Christian theologian...", 177, 138f. S. Cave makes similar qualifications, in other words they are compelled to write "as if" it were so.

2. J. Munck is emphatic that Paul is not a theologian in any modern sense. Paul's thinking is in a purely missionary context and is relevant only to the work he has done, is doing and will do. Munck refuses to include a single Chapter in his magnum opus with the title "Paul's Doctrine". The term simply does not apply. We regard this as a serious weakness in an outstanding work, and for the following reasons: 1. There is no such thing as a purely missionary situation which is not also a doctrinal situation. 2. Munck quotes Wrede ("Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.67 nl) in support, "An active character like Paul can only be clearly recognised in its activity". But what does "activity" mean, except the whole man in action and this includes his understanding? cf. J.S. Stewart, "A Man in Christ", 1935, pp.20ff. 3. Munck acknowledges that there are numerous doctrinal statements and inferences and conclusions in Paul's Epistles. The question is, how is Paul able to make these? He must be working from a coherent structure of thought from which he can sally forth as circumstances require. 4. Munck emphasises Paul's eschatological role.

Table of Contents in a treatise on Paul often reveals an orderly presentation of Paul's thought.<sup>1</sup> We think that it takes a system to produce a system.<sup>2</sup> The endless working over of Paul's meagre extant Epistles, his profound impact on Church and civilisation, his location within a Hebrew tradition which, even if not given to systematic arrangement as we now know it,<sup>3</sup> had a particular way of looking at reality, all forbid us to place Paul on the side of unorganised thinkers. The outcome is that

(cont'd) But is such a strict eschatology a simple or a complex structure? It is, in fact, very complex. Paul can only hold a view such as Munck claims for him, if he has thought the matter through. 5. We do not think that a volume so broadly based and so detailed in argument as "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind" is possible, unless the man who called it forth is in some sense a theologian. We are reminded of the prayer attributed to C.H. Spurgeon, "Oh God, bring in the elect and then elect some more". By the same token, let there be more theologians like the Paul who was no theologian!

1. E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, p.116, gives a table of Old Testament subjects to which Paul refers and says these read "like an outline of biblical theology". cf. the Table of Contents in A. Sabatier and C.A. Anderson Scott.

2. A. Schweitzer, "Paul and His Interpreters", 1912, p.vii, speaks of "the system of the Apostle of the Gentiles" which stood over against the teaching of Jesus. The terms, "the Pauline system", "Paul's system of doctrine", Paul's "system", or simply "Paulinism" recur throughout the volume (cf. pp. vi, vii, 10, 27, 62, 97, 190, 214, 241). We are left in no doubt that Schweitzer felt that he was confronted by a system of thought. He tries in his summing-up to clarify the inner logical connections by starting from Jewish primitive Christianity (p.240), ignoring both Greek philosophy and the Mystery religions, and emphasising Paul's eschatology which he regarded as a system (pp.62, 241) even if we do not possess the full elaboration of it.

3. cf. J. Denney, "The Theology of the Epistles", The Expositor, 6th Series, 3, pp.4f; J. Klausner, op. cit., p.596.

at times we may appeal with justice to a certain level of organisation in Paul's thought, but at the same time we know better than to treat him as if he were the first of the great dogmaticians. The ambivalence of our answer is reflected in our exegesis.

### The Third Scene in Fuller Detail.

We now examine the third scene more closely in order to distinguish the soliloquy more precisely and trace the development within the scene. In v14 the emphatic ἐγὼ δὲ throws the weight of the antithesis back to ὁ νόμος. The one is what the other is not. As the law belongs to the sphere of God, so the "I" belongs to the sphere of sin. The phrase περπατοῦντες ὑπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν which qualifies ἐσθλούς,<sup>1</sup> encourages us to think in terms of freedom, as do also the "residence" metaphor of v17 and the military metaphor of v23. Lack of freedom is characteristic of the position of the "I" which is essentially one of compulsion, deception and death. The converse of this lack of freedom is stated in 8:2 (cf. 8:4). The "I" is free in one sphere only, the sphere of sin, but is not free in the other sphere which is that of God. Hence the cry of v24 for deliverance rather than for advice or guidance. The "I", to illustrate, is not a border resident free to come and go across the frontier at his

---

1. Read ἐσθλούς with A,B,C,D,E,F,G rather than εὐπρεπείς as L,P, and many cursives. The context indicates an ethical, depreciatory sense. The word need not have this meaning in other contexts, cf. 2 Cor. 3:3; Jn. 3:6. It is unnecessary to distinguish sharply between εὐπρεπείς and ἐσθλούς. cf. Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., Blass-Debrunner-Funk, op. cit., W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.59 n1; A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.113; J. Murray, op. cit., p.259 n23; D.E.H. Whiteley, "The Theology of Paul", 1964, p.40; E. Fuchs, op. cit., p.70. Against cf. P. Bläser, op. cit., p.121 n90.

whim. He is a citizen of one land only. The country across the way is not open to him. His citizenship and thus his freedom lie in the land to which he belongs. In other words sin belongs to the existence of the "I" and not only to the will. We are therefore concerned with what F.J. Leenhardt<sup>1</sup> calls "ontological decadence". This condition of the "I" is manifested by the split within the "I".<sup>2</sup> We are forced to assert paradoxically that the "I" is opposed to the "I".<sup>3</sup> This message is presented to us in the form of a soliloquy in which the "I" makes necessary but contradictory statements about itself. Distinctions are made within the "I" which are differentiations in function and not signs of an underlying dualistic anthropology. The same "I" is the subject of willing and doing. The same "I" which is identified with sin (v14) is dissociated from sin. The "I" who sins is not the "I" who wills, not the "I" who agrees with the law. We resolve the apparent confusion when we adhere to the paradoxical mode of thinking which is expressed by the dramatic mode of presentation within which we have the soliloquy.

---

1. op. cit., p.198. cf. P. Blaser, op. cit., p.121; R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", I, p.245; C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.132; J. Blank, op. cit., pp.15, 18f; J. Knox, "The Interpreter's Bible", 9, p.486; E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp.11, 24.

2. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.97, organises the portrayal of the split into three parts, that between the law and sin, that between willing and doing, that between self and sin.

3. cf. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.59: "Der handelnde Ich ist anscheinend unabhängig vom wollenden Ich und stärker als dieses".



### The Change of Tense.

We have to note the change of tense in v14b where the present tense appears and then continues throughout the scene. A. Nygren makes much of this change in support of his claim that the passage refers to the present life of the Christian. M. Luther appeals to v14 for the first of his "Twelve Words" in support of a Christian reference.<sup>1</sup> C.L. Mitton<sup>2</sup> has suggested against Nygren that this is a case of an "historic present", "... there is no real change of tense, since Paul is describing not only the past as it was lived in self-reliance and separation from God, but the present too, if ever that same self-reliance reappears".<sup>3</sup> The change is therefore more apparent than real. In Paul's realistic presentation it is "as if" the past events are being relived before his inward eye.<sup>4</sup> If no other examples can be found in his Epistles, the exception proves the rule. This so unusual passage attracts to itself this so exceptional form. Not only is the experience being "relived", C.L. Mitton continues, it is "potentially ever present"<sup>5</sup> to the man in Christ and is actually present both to the man outside of Christ and to the Christian who steps out of his "in Christ" status.<sup>6</sup> These tensions in Christian living will then correspond to the paradoxes in Christian thinking.

1. "Luther's Lectures on Romans", ed. W. Pauck, 1961, p.201.

2. *op. cit.*, p.100. J.A. Bengel had already urged that the present tense be taken as a past.

3. *op. cit.*, p.135.

4. *ibid.* p.100. We regard this comment as a pointer in the right direction, namely to the understanding of a dramatisation.

5. *ibid.* p.134.

6. *ibid.* p.135.

J. Denney,<sup>1</sup> following B. Weiss, says that the εἶπε "is determined simply by the εἶπε preceding". The first present tense οἰδαμεν is unavoidable and paves the way for the second and what is begun is simply continued. Thus no abstruse explanations are called for. P. Althaus<sup>2</sup> moves back to v5 for the explanation: what is said in v5 in the past tense is repeated in v14 in the present tense. A. van Dulmen<sup>3</sup> sees a change of reference as the explanation of the change of tense. Paul takes the subject already discussed in vv7-13, namely, the law and sin (and death) in salvation history, and clarifies this out of the inner condition of man but this time without any salvation history reference. G. Bornkamm<sup>4</sup> also sees the change of tense as a reflection of the change in the context. The result of the irrevocable history of vv7-13 is now under review and we are shown how the fatal alliance between the law and sin works itself out in the "I".

We submit that the change of tense is to be explained by the change of scene within the dramatic presentation. In this further scene there is also a change in idiom. The "I" presents and elaborates what has

---

1. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", E.G.T., 2, 1900, p.641.

2. "Reply to A. Nygren", Theologische Literaturzeitung, 8 (1958), Col. 477.

3. op. cit., p.112.

4. op. cit., p.95.

previously been said but this time in a soliloquy in which the roles of the characters previously in view are rehearsed within the "I". The soliloquy requires the change in tense. We are therefore dealing with a "dramatic present". We mean by the term a tense which reflects the literary form in which the material is presented.

V15 confirms the antithesis made in v14 in defence of the law. In particular it elaborates the adverbial phrase "sold under sin". This elaboration continues beyond v15 to v23, in a complicated sequence which does not avoid repetition, in an effort to clarify how what has been opposed in v14 works out in the "I". In this sequence the four verbs οὐ γινώσκω v15, οἶδα v18, ἐπιβέβω v21, βλέπω v23, which express the "I"'s interpretation of its position, act as stepping-stones over which the argument proceeds. The "I" is thinking aloud but in a particular way. It is not offering new thoughts but is repeating what has already been offered in the different idiom of the first two scenes. There are new terms and additional metaphors certainly but although the tactics alter the strategy remains as before.

V16 makes an inference in favour of the law out of what has been said in v15. v17 explains vv15-16 and makes a further inference based on them. The metaphor from slavery in v14 is supplemented by the "residence" metaphor in v17. Sin inhabits the "I" as a dwelling-place so as to possess it. Thus the centre of gravity is shifted from sin ruling the "I" from without as a master a servant, to sin possessing the "I" from within as a resident in a dwelling. We wonder whether there is a connection between

the concept of sin indwelling and the soliloquising idiom and if so whether the concept influences the form or vice versa.

The shift in the centre of gravity achieves two ends. It fastens responsibility and therefore guilt on the "I". In agreeing with but not fulfilling the law, the "I" stands both self-condemned and condemned by the law.<sup>1</sup> It does this in a way which avoids any dualistic anthropology whereby the "I" could take refuge in a higher self and cry plague on the lower. The unity of the "I" is therefore preserved. The dichotomy is "in" the "I" in such a way that the "I" is the dichotomy.

The Anthropological Terms of vv22-23.

Vv18-20 repeat what has been said in vv14-17. v21 sums up the whole discussion in vv14-20 and is then itself further clarified by vv22-23, which offer special problems within a problem passage. Two expressions in particular complicate the development of thought. The first is the ἡ ἐν νόμῳ ἀνθρωπίνος which is found also in 2 Cor. 4:16 and Eph. 3:16. It is used with reference to the law here only. The background of this uncharacteristic Pauline phrase lies in the Hellenistic thought-world.<sup>2</sup> It belongs to the dualistic anthropology of Gnosticism. The philosophical basis is found in Plato.<sup>3</sup> The anthropological development

1. of. J. Denney, op. cit., p.642: "A true saint may say it in a moment of passion, but a sinner had better not make it a principle".

2. So O. Michel, op. cit., p.179 n1; F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.193 n2; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.98; E. Fuchs, op. cit., p.77; The Jerusalem Bible, p.279 n"K".

3. Republic, Book 9, 589a, ἡ ἐν νόμῳ ἀνθρωπίνος .

is advanced in Philo.<sup>1</sup> In the Gnostic Hermetic texts the anthropological and ethical dualism is well established.<sup>2</sup> We must however carefully avoid the fallacy that Paul must have used the phrase in the precise sense (if there was one) of its linguistic heredity.<sup>3</sup> We think it sufficient to note that the phrase was "current in the religious and philosophical vocabulary of the apostle's contemporaries".<sup>4</sup> For that matter the basic spatial metaphors in and out, up and down, here and there, are common coin. (cf. Mk.7:21; Lk.11:39). The context, and corresponding terms such as καρδιά<sup>5</sup> in Paul's use, provide our best guide at this point. W.G. Kummel makes the reservation in the exegesis of vv22-23, "... wir die Herkunft der Komplizierten Ausdrucksweise nicht kennen".<sup>6</sup>

1. See the references in Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., p.68.

2. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.193 n2 gives references; cf. Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., p.68.

3. W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p.136, n3 (of p.14), where he rightly refuses to take the ἐξω διερωτες and ἐξω διερωτες as the starting-point of Pauline anthropology.

4. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.193 n2.

5. E. Käsemann, op. cit., p.18: "... for the apostle the heart is the centre of human life and is the dominating term for personal existence". cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.37; J. Behm, T.D.N.T., 3, p.611.

6. op. cit., p.63.

In 2 Cor. 4:16<sup>1</sup>. and in Eph. 3:16 the phrase ὁ ἑγὼ ἄνθρωπος refers quite certainly to the Christian. It is the "new man" who is in view, the man who possesses the Spirit. If we assume therefore that Paul uses the phrase in 7:22 in an identical sense, this would make ὁ ἑγὼ ἄνθρωπος correspond to the new man who is the new creation of 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15 etc.<sup>2</sup>. We are unable to make this equation. If we have read the equivalents<sup>3</sup> in the passage correctly, and if these have already been placed in a different frame of reference, the identification of the ἑγὼ ἄνθρωπος with the new man in Christ is inadmissible. We must find another interpretation of the phrase which may clash with that established for 2 Cor. 4:16 and Eph. 3:16. We are then prepared to accept the resulting discrepancy in the double use by Paul. Paul does

1. The main Reformers see the whole passage and therefore this part of it as referring to Christians. M. Luther says the delight of v22 comes from the Holy Spirit (op. cit., p.206), as also A. Schweitzer, "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle", 1931, p.296. cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., pp.150f - the Platonic overtones in his Commentary at this point are surprising in a work so redolent of K. Barth's major work on Romans. Also J. Murray, op. cit., pp.257f.

2. 2 Cor. 4:16: ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ὁ ἐξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται ἀλλ' ὁ ἑγὼ ἡμῶν ἀνακαινύεται. The point here is the antithesis between the inner self and the physical body. In 7:22 the point is the antithesis between the inner self and sin.

3. The positive member in the two sets of opposites in v22 corresponds to τῷ θελοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν in v21 (cf. the willing in vv15, 18, 19). It picks up again the ἐντολὴν τῷ νόμῳ of v16. This law of God is further described as ὁ νόμος τοῦ νοῦς μου in v23. This latter is thus equivalent to the ἑγὼ ἄνθρωπος.



not possess the highly sophisticated and systematic anthropology of the present day.<sup>1.</sup> He has the trick of the preacher and teacher who ventures the ad hoc employment of terms if such a course suits his purpose. We must not deny to Paul the liberties which we allow to ourselves. W.G. Kümmel speaks of a formal deviation, a terminological deviation, at this point.<sup>2.</sup>

ὁ ἐξω ἀνθρώπος is the inner man or nature. The phrase can be used equally of the regenerate or the unregenerate. It is neutral until defined by the context. It is basically a spatial metaphor (ἐξω - an adverb of place) used anthropologically but in a theological context which comprises an argument to indicate the role of the law and within a form of presentation which governs the employment of terms. The commentators offer a variety of synonyms: the essential, the real, the true, the inmost, the deepest, the hidden, the invisible man. Again it is a case of a metaphor to explain a metaphor.

Two antitheses in the early Chapters of the Epistle may be helpfully recalled. Paul thinks characteristically in contrasts. In 2:28f we have the difference in kind between the Jew who is one ἐν τῷ

1. cf. M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.179: "Paul est toujours domine par les réalités qu'il envisage, au détriment parfois de la distinction précise des concepts".

2. op. cit., p.137: "...eine formale Abweichung von den sonstigen Vorstellungen des Paulus..." p.138: "Das Paulus das aber nicht als Widerspruch empfunden hat, mahnt uns, aus der zweifellos vorhandenen terminologischen Abweichung keine Folgerungen für die Gedankenwelt des Paulus zu ziehen". Also cf. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.203.

κρυπτῷ and he who is one only ἐν τῷ φανερῷ . Then in 1:18 - 3:20, we have the radical teaching on the lost nature of man but within this absolute state there are relative privileges. So in 7:22 the relative favour with which the "I" is regarded in the use of ἐξ ὧν ἀνθρώπους does not alter the frame of reference already established. The second conflict lies within the first, the subjective within the objective which is its presupposition. In terms of the dramatic figure the "I" takes into itself only the characters who have already appeared on the stage. Although new terms are used of the "I" itself, it is the very same "I" as before, the same condition of the "I" and in the same context or dramatisation.

The theme of the entire passage is the defence of the law. What Paul has to say in his anthropological adventure in vv22-23, has its background in the intention of honouring the law. The "I" is addressed by the law, that is, by God who is the law-giver. In consequence the "I" learns the holiness of the law and also its converse which is the sinfulness of the "I", both together, the one in the other. The need to emphasise the divine origin of the law makes Paul over-balance. He uses an uncharacteristic phrase which makes him vulnerable to a charge of inconsistency. The difficulty of the subject-matter is shown therefore by the unusual style and language of the passage and by the lack of any parallel in the extant Epistles. The experienced missionary in the Hellenistic field who is nothing if not adaptable, calls in the dualistic terminology familiar to him from the Hellenistic world. But this world is not his true home which is Hebraic. He therefore uses the terminology

which in another setting might be dualistic without any dualistic intention. The monism of the Hebrew tradition controls his thought. "Paul takes over the language of the Hellenistic-dualistic way of thinking but remoulds it to modes of expression of his own anthropology which is Christian, and determined on soteriological-eschatological lines."<sup>1</sup>

The term "stimulus diffusion" has been employed to account for certain linguistic oddities in Paul.<sup>2</sup> It focuses attention on the phenomenon of borrowing in inter-cultural relations. It refers to a form of cultural adaptation whereby a system or pattern is taken over with certain items of its content. The content however is entirely rejected and only the system or a part of it or an idea from it is adopted. C.C. McCown affirms,<sup>3</sup> "The concept of stimulus diffusion seems particularly

1. J. Behm, T.W.N.T., 2, p.697, quoted by C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.150, in favour of his view that ὁ ἕκω χυβερνῶν is the Christian man. It surely argues the other way.

2. R.P. Shedd, "Man in Community", 1958, p.93, makes use of the concept with acknowledgement to C.C. McCown, "The Sources of Pauline Mysticism", Munera Studiosa, edd. M.H. Shepherd and S.E. Johnson, 1946. McCown in turn makes acknowledgement to A.L. Kroeber, "Stimulus Diffusion", American Anthropologist, New Series, 42 (1940), 1-20 (and also to the latter's "Configurations of Cultural Growth", 1944, p.201 et pass., and "The Ladder of Progress in Palestine", 1943, p.114).

3. op. cit., p.57. He also uses the terms "stimulus diffusion or idea diffusion" (p.57); "diffusion or inter-cultural exchange" (p.56); cf. p.67, ".... 'stimulus diffusion' in which a new content, related but different, was put into another system". cf. A.L. Kroeber, op. cit., pp.1, 20. R.P. Shedd, op. cit., p.93 writes: "Still another category of conceptions (of Paul's) was subjected to the principle of 'stimulus diffusion'. This term refers to an old idea given a new orientation or content; the old and the new agree in form only".

applicable to the early Christian and Pauline use of Hellenistic religions".

We think that the concept is indeed a helpful one, although we find McCown's conclusion regarding Paul's mysticism<sup>1</sup> inadequate and his brief account of the "development" of Christianity inaccurate.<sup>2</sup> Apart from this recent technical use of the term "stimulus diffusion" under the influence of anthropology and sociology, the phenomenon has been widely recognised and for long.<sup>3</sup>

1. op. cit., p.67 (cf. p.61).

2. p.58 (cf. p.67). McCown is concerned with the application of scientific method to the history of early Christianity, in particular to the sources of Paul's interpretation of his mystical experience. He champions a modified diffusionist view of cultural development in which a balance is sought between diffusion and parallelism. Pauline mysticism is seen as a problem in inter-cultural relations, that is, in the light of the clash between Jewish and Hellenistic cultures as this affected the development of Christianity. McCown's conclusion is that Paul's mysticism was the result of "stimulus diffusion" and comprised a mixture of Jewish trust and belief expressed in the thought categories and language of the Mystery religions. cf. R.P. Shedd's rejection, op. cit., pp.95ff, of the Hellenistic Mystery religions as a source for Paul's doctrine of redemption and also of his anthropology; also B.M. Metzger's assertion, "The New Testament: its background, growth, and content", 1965, pp.245f, that ".... so far from borrowing, Paul made a deliberate effort to avoid using expressions which had associations with paganism".

3. cf. J. Denney, "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans", *The Expositor*, 6th Series, 3 (1901), pp.7ff; A. Schweitzer, "Paul and His Interpreters", 1912, pp.94f, 219, 238, 241; C.A. Anderson Scott, op. cit., p.129; R.M. Grant, "A Historical Introduction to the New Testament", 1963, p.67; N. Turner, "Philology in New Testament Studies", *Expository Times*, 71 (1959-60), pp.104ff. R. Bultmann, "Paul", *Existence and Faith*, 1961, p.130, says that Paul "makes use of" certain mythological notions while retaining his own out-look. F.F. Bruce, "The Epistles of Paul", *Peake* 1962, p.934, para. 810d, writes, "The difference in vocabulary which has been detected between these two epistles (i.e. Col. and Eph.) and their predecessors may be due in part to Paul's employment of the technical terms

A. van Dulmen believes that Paul thinks proleptically here.<sup>1.</sup>

The new order which proceeds from the work of Christ and is constituted by the Spirit has been revealed and anticipated within the old order. In that the "I" wills the good, agrees with the law, delights in the law, the plan of salvation is already present but remains "undeveloped" and accordingly brings no salvation. This comes only when the intention of the inner man reaches fulfilment through Christ. We are thus left with a salvation which does not save, or expressed from the standpoint of the "I", we have an insight which is powerless. G. Bornkamm<sup>2.</sup> is anxious to avoid all statements which facilitate anthropological bridge-building. R. Bultmann is, we think, vulnerable to this charge. For him the ἐγώ ἀνθρώπου is man "so far as he is aware of his reality, who (consciously or unconsciously) is determined and directed by it in his existence...."<sup>3.</sup> The inmost self is thus the bearer of man's real will and so continuity

---

(cont'd) of a controverted system of thought in what has been called a 'disinfected sense'. J.H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 111,13 - 1V,26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Fourth Gospel", N.T.S., 15 (1968-9), p.416, regarding the possible relation between the Fourth Gospel and IQS, speaks of a "prism effect", in which Qumranic concepts would be "refracted by the prism of John's originality and deep conviction that ...." cf. C.K. Barrett, "From First Adam to Last", 1962, p.56, regarding Philo; E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp.15f, 18. A related though not identical phenomenon is seen in the use of the O.T. in the N.T. which is dynamic rather than static - cf. C.H. Dodd, "According to the Scriptures", 1952, pp.130ff; E.E. Ellis, op. cit., pp.147ff. See also J. Barr, "The Semantics of Biblical Language", 1961, pp.21-45.

1. op. cit., pp.119f.

2. op. cit., p.99, cf. p.103 n32.

3. "Romer 7.....", p.202.

is secured between the old order and the new through the concept of the real (or authentic) existence. P. Althaus<sup>1</sup> is certainly open to this charge of anthropological bridge-building which Bornkamm is so careful to guard against. Althaus writes, "There is a reality in man to which the Holy Spirit does not say no, but yes .... What the inward man (i.e. reason) begins, the Spirit takes up, continues, makes effective ....".

We doubt very much that the theological problem does in fact arise here. The problem in question is how to assert both the continuity of the subject who passes (in v25a by anticipation and in 8:1ff explicitly) from the old order into the new, so that it is the same "I" in each case and yet at the same time also <sup>to</sup> assert the discontinuity of the states in which the subject stands, so that the point of connection is not located within the "I". If the issue is pressed we seek its resolution in two directions. First we must allow full weight to the unity of the "I" in the passage. The terms used in vv22f may be new but the frame of reference has already been set. We must interpret them within that frame. The ἐγὼ ἐν ὁπωπείᾳ which equals vous etc. and the μελή which equals μέλη etc. are not two separate identities disjoined from one another. They are the same "I" in different aspects. The "I" is portrayed functionally.<sup>2</sup> O. Michel comments, "Der Mensch ist nach verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten zerspalten; wir können nicht verschiedene Teile des Menschen von einander unterscheiden, da die Begriffe sich nicht

---

1. "Paulus und Luther Über den Menschen", 1963, p.58, our translation.

2. cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.135f.



ergänzen, sondern die besondere Bestimmtheit des menschlichen Daseins zum Ausdruck zu bringen versuchen".<sup>1</sup> The unity of these aspects is arrived at by organic connection rather than by arithmetical addition. No single aspect functions separately or independently. Thus the whole "I", including the ΕΓΩ ἄνθρωπος and its equivalent VOUS, has already been categorised as ἐξελκνός πεπλημένος ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ. The new terms of vv22f, which are clarifying in their intention but confusing in their effect, are subordinated to the broader "I" concept of the whole passage. Paul is too solid on his Hebrew-Christian foundation to err in the direction of anthropological dualism which is completely alien to his thought.<sup>2</sup> In the second place in order to maintain the continuity of the subject and the discontinuity of the states, we must think paradoxically. We state the one side of the paradox and then the other and we accept the resulting tension. Understanding is increased by clearer insight into each side, not by abandoning one side or the other. The essential pattern for this mode lies in the grand Christological paradox<sup>3</sup> which repeats

1. op. cit., p.178 and cf. n3.

2. cf. A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.116 n138; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp.98f. On Paul's debt to the Hebraic past see below pp.229ff.

3. For the paradoxical mode in Christian theology and its Christological pattern, see in particular D.M. Baillie, "God was in Christ", 1948, pp.106ff. He asserts paradox to be the condition of theology; the inevitable result of objectifying our personal relationship with God; the supreme instance being found in Christology which in turn makes necessary "the paradox of Grace" (p.114) as the main category for interpreting the Christian life. Chapter 5 in this volume is invaluable for this aspect.

itself at every level of thought, presenting us with an eschatological tension in which the continuity and discontinuity cohere. The inevitable element of paradox in theological analysis reflects the creative element in the gracious action of God in theological experience.<sup>1.</sup>

Much that has been written regarding ὁ ἕκω ἀνθρώπου in this context applies also to the second new term in v23, ἑὺς. The one is equivalent to the other. "Little would be gained by an attempt to distinguish between the 'mind' and the 'inner self'. Again, Paul is dependent on Hellenistic terminology, but even where he appears to borrow most he is in fact writing independently."<sup>2.</sup> The ἑὺς is the whole "I" in one of its various aspects and not a part which is to be added to other independent parts in order to reach the whole "I".<sup>3.</sup>

The cry of despair in v24 proceeds from the situation of despair which is described in the whole passage. It comes directly out of v23 which (with v22) elaborates the principle stated in v21, which in turn has summarised the entire discussion in vv14-20. The anguish of v24, which has been reached by the tortuous route from v14, recalls the antithesis which we called a "programmatic statement" in v14. The "I" is

1. cf. E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp.8, 22, on the necessity for miracle to bridge the gap and his rejection of the converse (man as a "constitutively spiritual being" p.14). We are involved here with the famous imago dei controversy.

2. C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1962, p.150.

3. For Paul's use of ἑὺς cf. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.193 n2; J. Behm, T.D.N.T., 4, pp.958f; R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, pp.211-13. In support of the correspondence of ἑὺς with ὁ ἕκω ἀνθρώπου cf. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.62; R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.203 and "Romer 7 ....", p.202; A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., p.146; E. Best, op. cit., p.83; Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., on ἑὺς p.546, 2.

wretched as a result of the conflict or split, as a result of the law of sin in which it is imprisoned, but above all as a consequence of encounter with the law of God over against which it must stand. It is ultimately the law which produces this anguish. C.K. Barrett<sup>1</sup> expresses the cause of this anguish through the equation between law and religion of which, after Barth, he makes illuminating use: "The source of Paul's wretchedness is clear. It is not a 'divided self', but the fact that the last hope of mankind, religion, has proved to be a broken reed. Through sin, it is no longer a comfort but an accusation. Man needs not a law but deliverance."

If we work in terms of the "I", we may project what has been said of the "I" in the passage to its conclusion. "There is no line which starts with 'I' and finishes somewhere with salvation and liberty."<sup>2</sup> The anguish is an expression of this fact. The cry of despair is a terminus beyond which the "I" on its own account cannot go. It is not given to man to save himself but it is given to him, through the law, to lament his situation. This he does with talent and without ceasing as the broad spectrum of human culture so eloquently testifies.

The rhetorical question τίς ἡ ἐποβή with which the scene ends requires no answering "God will!" as J. Moffatt suggests in his translation of the passage. The previous verses allow no possibility

1. op. cit., p.151.

2. K. Barth, "A Shorter Commentary on Romans", 1959, p.87. cf. A. Nygren, "Objektives und Persönliches im Römerbrief", Theologische Literaturzeitung, 10 (1952), Col. 596: "... denn das Evangelium beginnt immer am Nullpunkt".

of an answer from within their closed circle of thought. This is a cul-de-sac not a through road. A further scene which introduces a new actor, or at least is expressed in an idiom different from that of Scene Three, is required to carry forward the drama. We should not therefore read the future tense as hopeful. Nor is the question a prayer but rather an ejaculation. This anguished awareness is the most and the best that can be said about the "I" and it comes about through the law. In terms of the dramatic figure the author controls his plot. The "I" utters in soliloquy what the author makes it utter, just as the characters previously on stage play the parts which are allotted to them. We must not ask questions and expect answers which lie outside the terms of the presentation. If we do so then we must realise that we are making abstractions and we must ground our conclusions elsewhere than in 7:7-25.

#### The Influence of Hebrew and Greek Culture on Paul.

At this point, before leaving the subject of Scene Three, we must retrace our steps and take up an issue on which we have touched in considering vv22f, namely, the relative indebtedness of Paul to Hebrew and to Greek culture. It is impossible to determine precisely the proportions in which Paul was influenced by his Damascus road encounter, by the primitive Church, by his Jewish heritage and by the Hellenistic world. We would place the last-named at the foot of the list. The influence of his Hebrew background on the other hand was of very great importance.

1. If Paul was removed to Jerusalem at a very early age, as W.C. van Unnik has argued at length, the Hebrew influence would be massive from the start. Even if he was reared in Tarsus we cannot assume a significant

Greek influence. If the Gischala tradition of Jerome<sup>1.</sup> is to be relied on, and Paul belonged to the first generation of a family's enforced residence in Tarsus, such a family would have a strong tendency against integration. Jerome apart, it is unlikely that a Pharisee family would have significant contacts within pagan religious circles in a foreign land.<sup>2.</sup> We place very little importance on the line of investigation represented by H. Böhlig.<sup>3.</sup> It may tell us much about Tarsus but very little about Paul.

2. Regarding the possibility of Paul having received a secular Greek education, W.F. Albright writes,<sup>4.</sup> "There is absolutely nothing in Paul's

1. The tradition, in Jerome's Commentary on Philemon (on v23, derived from Origen - so J. Weiss, op. cit., p.181 nl) and also in De Viris Illustribus, 5, is late - fourth century A.D. J. Klausner, op. cit., p.304, accepts it. J. Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", 1959, p.291 nl, regards Jerome as unreliable for information about early Christianity and rejects it as incompatible with Ac. 22:3. R. Bultmann, "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961, p.112, thinks it uncertain and improbable in view of Ac. 21:39. A.D. Nock, op. cit., p.21, supposes that it refers to an ultimate origin rather than to an immediate one. J. Weiss, "The History of Primitive Christianity", 1, p.181 nl, sees substance underlying it.

2. cf. A. Schweitzer, "Paul and his Interpreters", 1912, p.87: S. Cave, op. cit., p.24. In our own day the number of devout Christians in Scotland who have first-hand acquaintance with the communist ideological alternative to the Gospel, or with the cults appearing in the cities, is very small and the stronger the conviction, the less the likelihood of such contact. The account given by G. La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire", H.T.R., 20 (1927), of the inter-action of resident and incoming ethnic communities, encourages caution in relating Paul's family to the existing culture.

3. "Die Geisteskultur von Tarsus im augusteischen Zeitalter mit Berücksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften", 1913. J. Munck, op. cit., p.12 nl, (cf. p.144 n2), describes Böhlig's attempted reconstruction as "on the whole an unprofitable excursion". cf. W.M. Ramsay, "The Cities of St. Paul", 1907, pp.85-244 for an earlier resume of information about Tarsus. See also J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology", Expository Times, 76 (1964-65), pp.27f, against emphasising a Tarsian background.

4. "Paul's Education", The Acts of the Apostles, (Anchor Bible), J. Munck, 1967, Appendix viii, p.312.

references to popular philosophy or in his rare use of Greek aphorisms or of common rhetorical devices to indicate that he had ever received a secular Greek education. The total lack of evidence that Paul knew the Greek classics is alone conclusive proof that he had never studied Greek formally - at least beyond an elementary school. That he could speak Greek fluently and without an Aramaic accent, I do not dispute for a moment".

3. Recent specialist work on the Jewish background of Paul has established the fact of his indebtedness without agreement on the precise extent. W.D. Davies<sup>1</sup> provided a very significant landmark in Pauline studies with his emphasis on the rabbinic antecedents of Paul's thought rather than on Hellenism. Davies relates Paul's anthropology and Christology and Christ-mysticism to Jewish influences. He sees Paul in the light of a first century rabbi who has baptised his heritage into Christ. H.J. Schoeps<sup>2</sup> offers similar conclusions although he differs from Davies in drawing more often on Hellenistic ideas, especially in Paul's Christology, and of course in his religious standpoint. R. Bultmann gives a much larger place to Hellenistic influence - heathen cults, Oriental and Gnostic myths - while maintaining Paul's Jewish and rabbinic roots.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", second ed. 1955. A. Sabatier, op. cit., p.23, identifies Pharisaism as one of Paul's main sources. cf. W. Wrede op. cit., p.4.

2. "Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History", 1961.

3. See for instance "Paul", Existence and Faith, 1961 and "Theology of the New Testament", 1, pp.187ff.



J. Klausner's summing-up<sup>1</sup> of the matter is an interesting testimony from a modern rabbi, "Intensive research over many years has brought the writer of the present book to a deep conviction that there is nothing in the teaching of Paul - not even the most mystical elements in it - that did not come to him from authentic Judaism. For all the theories and hypotheses that Paul drew his opinions directly from the Greek philosophical literature or the mystery religions of his time have no sufficient foundation". Then Klausner adds the qualification, "But it is a fact that most of the elements in his teaching which came from Judaism received unconsciously at his hands a non-Jewish colouring from the influence of the Hellenistic-Jewish and pagan atmosphere with which Paul of Tarsus was surrounded during nearly all his life, except for the few years which he spent in Jerusalem". The Qumran investigations have strengthened the view that emerging Christianity stood on a solid basis of Judaism but of a variety outside the mainstream of which the non-conforming Sect is a well-documented example.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. "From Jesus to Paul", 1944, p.466. cf. also pp.307, 453f, 458, 462ff, 583, 591, 606, 608f. Klausner claims agreement from G.F. Moore with the first part of the above quotation (p.466 n53).

2. The deep indebtedness of Paul to his Jewish background, with or without the recent more sophisticated understanding of how this was constituted, has been widely recognised, as also its converse of a diminished estimate of Greek influence: eg. A. Schweitzer, "Paul and his Interpreters", 1912, p.204, cf. pp.94-96, 99, 176, 215, 218f, 222f, 238, 239f - Schweitzer counsels us to leave out Greek influence and understand Paul from Jewish primitive Christianity while maintaining his eschatology to the full; A.S. Peake, op. cit., pp.287, 298; H.A.A. Kennedy, "St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things", 1904, pp.43ff, 342ff also his "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions", 1913, pp.154ff; C.A. Anderson Scott, op. cit., pp.vii, 3f, 9f, 21, 251ff; A.D. Nock, "St. Paul", 1938, pp.77, 236; J. Jeremias,

4. A fuller understanding of the unity between Old Testament and New Testament in recent research has helped to identify the very close relation between Paul and his Hebrew background in particular in the Old Testament. We thus have to modify the thesis of W.D. Davies not only as a result of Qumran studies<sup>1.</sup> but also from an understanding of Paul's use of the Old Testament under the influence of the primitive Church and ultimately of Jesus.<sup>2.</sup>

---

(cont'd) op. cit., pp.28f; E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, pp.10, 82ff, 149 and see his resume in "Paul and his Recent Interpreters", 1961, pp.29ff; A.M. Hunter, "The Words and Works of Jesus", 1950, p.71 and his "Interpreting the New Testament", 1951, p.70 "...if Paul derived his message from his environment, he did what no other missionary has ever done - borrowed his gospel from the people among whom he worked", also his "Introducing New Testament Theology", 1957, pp.87ff; J.S. Stewart, "A Man in Christ", 1935, pp.32-80; E. Howell, "St. Paul and the Greek World", Expository Times, 71 (1960), 328ff.

1. We have dealt with the possibility of Persian influence in Qumran (above pp.84ff). If this is allowed to be the case then Paul's Jewish base must be modified accordingly.

2. E.E. Ellis, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament", 1957, p.1: "While rabbinic Judaism has influenced the mechanics of Pauline citation, one must look to the apostolic Church and to Christ Himself to find the primary source of the apostle's understanding and use of the OT. The emphases, applications and hermeneutics of Paul's quotations mark him as one with the apostolic Church in contrast to his rabbinic background". cf. also pp.83, 74f regarding "the great gulf" separating Paul's use of the Old Testament from that of the rabbis, which was determined by Paul's Christological interpretation. Klausner's estimate (op. cit., pp.453f) must be modified.

4. Scene Four. v25a.

We must first consider certain textual and exegetical problems.

The interjected thanksgiving suggests a break in the flow of the passage and the supposition has given rise to textual variations. None of these affects the text significantly. H. Lietzmann's treatment<sup>1.</sup> of the textual problem here is a model of its kind. We hold the correct reading to be Χάρις τῷ Θεῷ as exhibited in B; Sah.; Origen Mart.3; Methodius Resurr. 11, 8, 3; Hier. Ep. 121, 8. This original reading has been modified to ὦ Χάρις τῷ Θεῷ thus substituting a positive affirmation for the exclamation and also to ὦ Χάρις Κυρίου in G and certain Latin texts in an effort to provide a tidy answer to the question of v24. The reading ἐὺχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, which also occurs without the article, is extensively supported, in ℣\*; A; Sy.; Or. and many cursives. It is intended to strengthen the answer to v24 but is explained by the reduplication of the τῷ with the subsequent addition of the prefix ἐὺ. The diphthong could also be a misreading of - οὐ from the preceding τοῦτο. A few MSS. add δε which softens the asyndeton but is missing in the other variants and therefore may be assumed with good reason not to belong to the original text. Thus the variants can be adequately explained from the original reading Χάρις τῷ Θεῷ.<sup>2.</sup>

1. "An die Römer", 1928, p.74. cf. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1902, p.184.

2. Most commentators read Χάρις τῷ Θεῷ eg. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.65; O. Michel, op. cit., p.180; O. Kuss, op. cit., p.459. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and Nestle adopt Χάρις τῷ Θεῷ. Souter (with Χάρις δε in the margin) and von Soden read ἐὺχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, no doubt on account of the support of ℣ and some of the Koine. N.E.B. follows Nestle but goes beyond translation in the elaboration, "God alone, through Jesus Christ our Lord".

We reject the suggestion that a rearrangement of the text is necessary in order to tidy up the logical order and furnish the revised sequence: v23, v25b, v24, v25a.<sup>1</sup> There is no textual basis for such a change. The familiar order, although presenting difficulties, is by no means incomprehensible. We must allow Paul to be himself in style as in thought. Chapters 5 and 6 have just been before the reader with their rich Christological content. We see v25a as a change of scene. The logic of the passage is agreeable to the liberty of the author to follow a lengthy scene with a short one, to suggest as well as to elaborate, to break the flow of the passage as he chooses in keeping with his purpose. We do not require to impose a logic on the passage as do those who seek to rearrange. We try rather to grasp its own logic which is that appropriate to the drama portrayed.

The "formula of thanksgiving"<sup>2</sup> appears suddenly in answer to the question in v24. We move with it into another realm yet there is no bridge by which we pass from what has been said of the "I" to what is now expressed. The transition is abrupt and unexpected with an hiatus between. This hiatus signifies the change of scene. We can find no element of hope hiding in the despairing cry of v24 which might serve as a bridge.

1. F. Muller, "Zwei Marginalien im Brief des Paulus an die Römer", *Z.N.T.W.*, 40 (1940-41), 249-252. He further adopts the sequence 8:2, 1, 3. of J. Moffatt's foot-note ad loc. and K.E. Kirk, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1937, p.208.

2. J. Murray, *op. cit.*, p.269. cf. the parallels in Arndt-Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p.886, under ὑμῶν, 5.

The discontinuity is marked. The exegetical hiatus reflects the theological emphasis in the phrase "vertically from above". It is precisely the dramatic form which allows Paul to make the assertions which are necessary without saying or implying more than his basic theology permits. Paul is no Shakespeare but he is a wise man and is content to hurry on having said just enough, and Chapter 8 is to come.

H. Lietzmann<sup>1</sup> conjectures that a fuller statement was intended which would have led into 8:1ff but that this was prevented by a characteristic interruption. He cites as similar cases 1:13; 7:25; 1 Cor. 15:56; 2 Cor. 3:17; 5:16. This supposition however goes further than the facts permit. V25a is an explicit reply to the question of v24, terse and unexpected and inadequate though it be. Paul "... knows the answer to his own questions - knows it so well that with unstudied dramatic aposiopesis he does not express it in words".<sup>2</sup> It is as if the strain of sustaining the negative sequence from v7 and the unaccustomed form must be relieved<sup>3</sup> by the positive outburst before the final summarising statement in v25b. Thus the cry of anguish is balanced by the cry of thanksgiving. Emotion replies to emotion in a logic of its own. C.H. Dodd<sup>4</sup> uses the emotional character of v24 to argue for the autobiographical

1. op. cit., p.74.

2. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.151. The implication here of the word "dramatic" should not be missed.

3. of. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.185: "the sigh of relief in v25". M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.180 says, "comme un éclair dans la nuit".

4. op. cit., p.107. of. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.186.

reference of the passage, "A man is not moved like that by an ideal construction". But it is only an "ideal construction" in as far as it is a drama and the cry of v24 and the so brief dénouement of v25a are entirely in keeping with the chosen form.

There is a definite connection between v25a and 8:1ff.<sup>1</sup> The former anticipates the latter and is then elaborated by it. V25a is both an "interjected parenthesis" and an "anticipatory exclamation".<sup>2</sup> This is the first place in the passage which began at v7, at which explicit and unequivocal Christian terms are used. A line has been traced in vv7-24 in which the "I" dominates. Now another and disconnected line appears which starts with Jesus Christ. The thanksgiving is offered to God "through Jesus Christ". This is the standard Christian formula for piety and for liturgy.<sup>3</sup> It is more a formula than an explicit doctrinal

1. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.98, speaks of the anticipatory clause; cf. G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.99; E. Stauffer, op. cit., p.359; A.M. Hunter, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1955, p.74: "v25a paves the way for Ch.8"; P. Benoit, op. cit., p.123; R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.113; C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.134; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.186: "It is just in his manner to sum up thus in a sentence what he is about to expand into a chapter"; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.172; E. Best, op. cit., p.84. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.195, denies that there is an anticipatory role and refers to "the Jewish habit of intercalating doxologies which seem to break up the sequence of ideas". So also E. Gaugler, "Der Römerbrief", 1, 1945, p.232 who refers to 1:25 and speaks of a characteristic Jewish interruption with answers that give praise and interjections that anticipate.

2. The phrases are from R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.113.

3. cf. R. Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", 1, p.128. cf. 1:18; Col. 3:17. See also 1 Cor. 15:57, where the ὁ δὲ τοῦ κρείου can be taken either as gratitude to the victory-giving God or as defining the victory; also physical death is in view and it is the element of victory which governs the context.



statement. We should not try to draw too rich a content from the thanksgiving. Certainly whenever Jesus Christ with the appellation "Lord" is before us, lines run out in many directions, but here the immediate purpose is strictly limited. What has to be said will be better said in another way. What has been said is the main burden of the present exercise. The mere hint given in the fourth scene is sufficient for the purpose and enables Paul to hurry on to the positive side of the over-all antithesis. It is unnecessary to ask with O. Kuss<sup>1</sup> whether the objective, saving act on the Cross is in mind or the present activity of Christ. A. van Dülmen<sup>2</sup> also goes beyond the actual intention of v25a in making a connection between the death of Christ and the law, similar to that which exists with sin.

If we recall what we have said about the attitude to drama in the Jewish culture, we can understand best of all why the fourth and final scene is so brief. In the London theatre of the present day, the representation of God on the stage is not thought worthy of comment far less of criticism. This is a very far cry indeed from the Jewish practice in Paul's day. Not only was the drama as a form of communication and interpretation not favoured by the Jews, as we have indicated, the very idea of the representation of the Deity by means of the drama was unthinkable. The reverence with which God was regarded in the Jewish

---

1. op. cit., p.460.

2. op. cit., p.99.

ethos appears in the extreme in the earlier consonantal substitution in the enunciation of the Divine name in the reading of the Old Testament. It is also encountered in the later Islamic offshoot of the Hebrew faith in which artistic reproduction was confined to geometric forms. The human form was not depicted far less the divine. When Paul comes to the end of his theological analysis in dramatic form, he is unable to rest content with the bleak fact of the agony and enigma of man apart from Jesus Christ. It will simply not do to end with ἵς μὲ πὺ ῥῆ ῥῆ ῥῆ ῥῆ ῥῆ (v24). Such a course would not be true to his knowledge and experience. The restrictions imposed by his Jewish inhibitions prevent him from bringing the Lord God on the stage. So he makes only an oblique reference to God in the form of a thanksgiving and in the briefest possible compass. He has then made his point and he has done so without contravening the rules. When the dramatisation is ended the restraints no longer apply. He can set forth what God has done with all liberty and this he does in the long Chapter 8 and, after the involved dialectic of Chapters 9-11 has been worked out, he can lead up to the climax in 11:36, "Source, Guide and Goal of all that is - to him be glory for ever!" (N.E.B.) In saying that he has said all.

##### 5. The Summarising Conclusion. v25b.

The smooth and logical flow of the passage is thought by some to be jarred by the sudden interjection of v25a and then confused by the repetitious v25b. In the interests of an easier text various suggestions

have been made.

a. Paul himself may have made an addition in the course of dictating<sup>1.</sup> or perhaps he paused to add the positive words of v25a in order to avoid concluding on a negative note but then on resuming summarised the plight of the "I" once more and for the last time, in v25b.<sup>2.</sup>

b. The amanuensis became confused in the course of a difficult task and misunderstood Paul's intention.<sup>3.</sup>

c. A scribal insertion was made at a very early date of a marginal note deriving from some copyist, reader, or Church commentator whose intention was to smooth the path of the reader.<sup>4.</sup> Thus we would have the rare phenomenon of a primary corruption which affected all our surviving MSS. R. Bultmann<sup>5.</sup> sees not only a gloss here and at 8:1, but one which has also been wrongly located in the text. It should come after v23. 8:2 then becomes the correct conclusion of vv14ff.

1. G. Zuntz, "Text of the Epistles", 1953, p.16. He also suggests a summing-up by some earlier reader.

2. E. Stange, "Diktierpausen in den Paulusbriefen", Z.N.T.W., 18-19 (1917-20), pp.109-117 especially pp.110f.

3. A suggestion of J. Moffatt, C.H. Dodd etc.

4. C.H. Dodd ad loc. etc.

5. Also A. Jülicher ad loc.; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.172 who says that v25b is perhaps misplaced; A. van Dülmen, op. cit., p.119 says a gloss is not improbable; "The Jerusalem Bible" ad loc. n "O", sees an addition; G. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.103 n33 takes v25b as a gloss but not 8:1; E. Fuchs emends and rearranges while H. Braun says that it is dubious and omits discussion of v25b. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.67 n5 gives references.

d. F. Müller<sup>1</sup>. argues for a rearrangement rather than a deletion, which results in the sequence v23, v25b, v24, v25a and then 8:2, 1, 3.

We are not convinced by these explanations. In the case of F. Müller it is very difficult to work back from the rearranged text to that which has come down to us. A wholly convincing hypothesis must explain adequately and without exegetical acrobatics how the change took place. In addition Müller can quote no MSS. evidence. In all our MSS. v25b comes after vv24-25a. As far as the supposed gloss is concerned a complete absence of MSS. support argues very strongly against such. Certainly a primary corruption is a possibility but the evidence adduced from within the passage is very subjective and hypothetical. We cannot allow that the proposed emendation is a brilliant deduction from the facts because we dispute the facts. It then becomes exegetical arrogance to rearrange the text without the most solid grounds. J. Moffatt<sup>2</sup> says that the logical position of v25b is before the climax of v24. But what does "logical" mean in this assertion? Is it Moffatt's logic or Paul's? We must not overlook the possibility that the passage has a logic of its own. In fact it imposes its own canons on us rather than the reverse and in any case one man's sense is another man's nonsense. In similar vein

---

1. op. cit., W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.67, cites other earlier examples of the transfer of v25 to a position between v23 and v24. J.B. Phillips ad loc., places v25b after v23. K. Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", H.T.R., 56 (1963), p.175, considers the attempts at textual reconstruction in the light of the influence of the Western introspective view, as he understands it.

2. "The Moffatt Bible", foot-note ad loc. cf. J. Moffatt, "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament", third ed. 1918, p.143.

C.H. Dodd<sup>1</sup> says, "it is scarcely conceivable that ....", but again we ask, conceivable to whom? If another sound explanation can be given which fits the context we must prefer such in the absence of MSS. evidence to the contrary, otherwise we bully Paul to suit our own sense of order and logic. Also we must allow the emotion-charged v24 and v25a to make their impact on the order.

When we understand the form of presentation in dramatic terms and see v25a as a very attenuated scene, v25b then becomes a conclusion outside of the dramatic sequence which it summarises. In this way we can go behind the supposed problem which the emendation and rearrangement claim to solve. There is in fact no problem. R.V.G. Tasker,<sup>2</sup> referring to the principles on which the translators of the N.E.B. proceeded, says, ".... pure conjectures should not be admitted to the text; and this should apply to conjectural rearrangements as well as to verbal changes". The text of the N.E.B. makes no rearrangement and no deletion here. We consider it necessary to leave the text in its transmitted form.<sup>3</sup>

1. "The Epistle to the Romans", 1932, pp.114f.

2. "The Greek New Testament", 1964, p.vii. Regarding the text presented in the N.E.B., F.F. Bruce, "The English Bible", second ed. 1970, p.241, says, "Rarely if ever has conjecture been resorted to". He is referring to the New Testament in the N.E.B., in the Old Testament conjecture is required on occasion.

3. So W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.67f who comments that Paul often argues in a way that is at first incomprehensible. cf. C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.151; F.F. Bruce, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans", 1963, p.156; E.H. Gifford, "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans", 1886, p.144; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.180; E. Best, op. cit., p.84. T. Zahn reads v25b and 8:1 as a question, the assertion of the latter answering the question of the former. This view (according to J. Kürzinger, "Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis von Röm 7", *Biblische Zeitschrift*, Neue Folge 7-8 (1963-4), p.272 n4) was already represented by Didymus of Alexandria.

V25b presents a formula in the shape of an antithesis which summarises<sup>1.</sup> in a simplified way what has been said in the first instance in vv22f, but also in the whole section. V25a is no obstacle to regarding v25b as a summary when we recognise its provisional and interjected character.<sup>2.</sup> The summary is brief and to the point. The emotional overtones of v24 and v25a are wholly lacking. There is a disconnection in style which we have explained as a summarising conclusion outwith the dramatic sequence proper.<sup>3.</sup>

The combination of the particles ἀπὸ οὐκ<sup>4.</sup> in v25b is of classical use and is also found in the Koine. In the New Testament it is peculiar to Paul.<sup>5.</sup> It is frequent in Romans. We should note in

1. W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.65f says the premiss of v25b is the whole section vv14-24; cf. O. Kuss, op. cit., p.460; J. Murray, op. cit., pp.270f; A. van Dulmen, op. cit., p.118; C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.151; F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.156; C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.134; E. Best, op. cit., p.84; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p.180; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.184.

2. H. Lietzmann, op. cit., p.78, notes the parallel in Chapter 10 where v17, which is introduced by the simple ἀπὸ, summarises vv15-17.

3. A. Nygren's lack of discussion of v25 is striking. The paraphrases offered by W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p.178 and C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.134 are illuminating. C.L. Mitton's medical metaphor (ibid. p.134) of the "moral diabetic" is less successful.

4. N.E.B. translates "In a word then ..." cf. J.B. Lightfoot, "Notes on Epistles of St. Paul", 1895, p.305: "To sum up then..."

5. This paragraph summarises M.E. Thrall, "Greek Particles in the New Testament", 1962, pp.10-11.



particular 7:3 and 8:12; also 5:18; 9:15, 16, 18; 14:19; and Gal. 6:16; 1 Thess. 5:6; 2 Thess. 2:15. We should also include Rom. 14:12 and Eph. 2:19 on the principle of preferring the more difficult reading. "The purpose of the combination is presumably to provide an emphatically inferential connective".<sup>1.</sup> <sup>21</sup>ἀπὸ alone at the beginning of a sentence in Paul is always connective eg. Rom. 10:17; 1 Cor. 15:18; 2 Cor. 5:14; 7:12; Gal. 6:10. The combination of the two implies logical connection, the one reinforcing the other. It is several times used by Paul to sum up the argument of a whole section (rather than merely indicating the logical consequences of the immediately preceding sentence considered in isolation).<sup>2.</sup> We hold that this summary of M.E. Thrall gives decisive support to regarding v25b as a summary of the preceding passage. In the nearer distance it connects with vv22-23 which in turn itself summarises the preceding. In the further distance it sums up the argument from v14. It adds nothing to it. Any apparent difference can be fully explained from the preceding. F.J. Leenhardt<sup>3.</sup> would accordingly appear to be mistaken in saying that it is not a satisfactory summary of the preceding.

We note the significance of <sup>21</sup>ἀπὸς <sup>21</sup>ἐγώ. From v7 the <sup>21</sup>ἐγώ keeps appearing both as a pronoun in the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative cases and in the verbal first person singular. This is the final

---

1. *ibid.* p.10.

2. eg. Rom. 5:18; 7:25; 8:12; 14:19; Gal. 6:10.

3. *op. cit.*, p.195.

occurrence in Chapter 7. The two pronouns together must be regarded as having a force different from one such alone. They are emphatic.<sup>1</sup> They give the summarising conclusion at the end of the dramatisation. Our translation should convey this impression. "I myself"<sup>2</sup> is weak. "I of myself"<sup>3</sup> is better but requires strengthening. An adequate translation is represented by the following: "entirely on his own";<sup>4</sup> "relying on his own resources";<sup>5</sup> "I, leaving Jesus Christ our Lord out of the question";<sup>6</sup> "I in my own strength";<sup>7</sup> "I left to myself";<sup>8</sup> "in my own nature I ...";<sup>9</sup> "without the help of God".<sup>10</sup> B. Weiss paraphrases<sup>11</sup>.

1. A.T. Robertson, "A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament", 1908, p.79 describes the occurrence in v25b as an intensive and uncommon use of αὐτός and instances also Lk. 20;42 and 1 Thess. 4:9.

2. A.V.; R.V.; N.E.B.; Weymouth 1902; "The Twentieth Century New Testament", 1902; "The Book of Books", 1938. M. Luther has simply "ich". The Zurich Bible of Zwinglian antecedents has "ich selbst".

3. A.S.V.; R.S.V. cf. "Good News for Modern Man; The New Testament in Today's English Version", 1966, "by myself I ....".

4. C.L. Mitton, op. cit., p.133.

5. C.L. Mitton, ibid. p.134; R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., p.112: "I of my own resources"; cf. A.M. Hunter, "The Epistle to the Romans", 1955, p.74.

6. J. Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", E.G.T., 2, 1900, p.643.

7. F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p.153.

8. J. Moffat; J.A.T. Robinson, "The Body", 1952, p.32.

9. J.B. Phillips.

10. P. Bläser, op. cit., p.123: "Der Mensch für seine eigene Person ....., ohne die Hilfe Gottes ...".

11. quoted W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp.66f.

helpfully, "Ich für meine Person, ohne jene höhere errettende Dazwischenkunft, welch ich Christo verdanke".

W.G. Kummel<sup>1</sup> gives "ich selbst (und kein anderer)" and "ich selbst=eben ich", on the ground that in other New Testament passages this is the meaning. Examination shows that this is indeed the case. In these passages Paul speaks quite certainly of his own person. But three special factors operate in v25b.

a. αὐτός ἐγώ is the culminating use in a series which employs ἐγώ in a literary technique which is quite special. Kummel characterises this as a "Stilform", that is, a special literary technique. We have argued that we are in fact dealing with an explicit dramatisation.

b. It receives its content from the preceding discussion. Kummel affirms this clearly but does not seem to follow through, with his very bare rendering "ich selbst".

c. αὐτός ἐγώ stands over against the following ἐν Χριστῷ ἰησοῦ. The antithesis must be kept in view in the translation. The N.E.B. rendering of v25a, "God alone ....", which we described as a paraphrase rather than a translation, catches the train of thought correctly. The antithesis is: God alone - I alone (that is, I apart from God).<sup>2</sup>

1. op.cit., pp.66f.

2. C.L. Mitton, op. cit., pp.132ff sees the correct assessment of αὐτός ἐγώ as the key to the whole passage. Again we affirm that there are no "keys" in this sense. The interpretation must be broadly based, cf. R.N. Longenecker op. cit., pp.112-114, who also stresses the αὐτός ἐγώ.

It is important that we understand αὐτός ἐγώ as referring to the ἐγώ already in view from v7. When we establish that αὐτός ἐγώ means "I relying on my own resources" and when we appreciate that the αὐτός ἐγώ is the same ἐγώ as before, then we can read this meaning into each occurrence of ἐγώ from v14. We cannot relate the double pronouns to Paul personally<sup>1</sup>, unless we have felt obliged to do so previously. This essential connection of αὐτός ἐγώ with the previous discussion is confirmed when we examine the actual terms of the antithesis in v25b in the light of what has preceded.

M. Luther<sup>2</sup> seizes on v25b as the last of his "Twelve Words", as the all-illuminating verse which clinches the argument relating Chapter 7 to the Christian present. We find this understanding unsatisfactory. Luther's view here depends on the sense given to δοῦλεύω. But in our view this should be based on the preceding verses 16 and 22, with their βούλομαι and βουηδόμεαι. We are at exactly the same place as we were in verses 16 and 22. We should continue the line followed there. The sense of δοῦλεύω here is well represented by "I am subject to". It does not mean "I serve", in the sense of being fully obedient in action. The latter is disallowed by vv14ff.<sup>3</sup> We should throw the stress on the

1. As does Blass-Debrunner-Funk, op. cit., para. 281: "Paul certainly applies the words to himself", with a query as to the text.

2. op. cit., pp.208f.

3. cf. O. Kuss, op. cit., p.460. and against J. Murray, op. cit., pp.270f.

objective authority of the law rather than on the subjective response to the law.

We should import the earlier distinction between willing and doing in vv15, 18 and 21, into the antithesis of v25b. v23 is the necessary background with its ἕτερος νόμος and νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας. The same ἐγώ is the subject in both parts of the antithesis. νόμος and ἁμαρτία here as earlier, are functions of the same ἐγώ. There is no dualism intended whereby in one part of the antithesis the ἐγώ is on the side of the angels and in the other part, not. The other side of the story, already anticipated in v25a, comes in 8:2 with its opposing laws and in a form of presentation different from the dramatic form of 7:7ff.

CONCLUSION.CHAPTER 8.

We have not been able to find any single "key" with which to unlock the problems set by Romans 7:7-25. Those who claim to have found such have, we believe, greatly exaggerated their case.<sup>1</sup> We have first examined the Epistle in which the passage lies embedded, on the principle that understanding the whole is likely to aid understanding of the part. In our introductory investigations we have led arguments that the Church in Rome was more complex in its structure than a straight Jewish-Christian: Gentile-Christian division. The influence of the Jewish-Christian presence, which had been stronger in the time prior to 57-58 A.D., was still, we think, an important factor. Nevertheless we have been obliged to give νομος a wider reference than the Torah. The Genesis allusion and the salvation history scheme broaden Paul's view away from a too narrow concentration on the Torah, although that of course looms large. It may be too that we have to credit Paul with a more philosophical turn of mind

---

1. C.L. Mitton, op. cit., understands the key to lie in the correct appreciation of the ἀντὶς ἐγώ (cf. R.N. Longenecker, op. cit., pp.96, 112). J. Kürzinger, op. cit., understands the crux of the matter to be the correct assessment of 7:25b which he moves to Chapter 8. He then takes v25b - 8:4 as a unit and thus goes behind the traditional Chapter division which derives from the Middle Ages. F.J. Leenhardt, op. cit., p.198, suggests that Gal. 2:18 is a resume of 7:7-25 and that it provides a guide-line for its interpretation. A.J. Bandstra, op. cit., p.141 (cf. p.148), thinks that the key lies in Gal. 2:15-20. T. Fahy, op. cit., p.187 (cf. p.188), identifies Gal. 5:2-4 as "the key to the solution of this passage", in its rejection of the abrogated Mosaic Law as a means of salvation. Others see the recognition of the autobiographical reference as the vital factor. P. Blaser, op. cit., p.123, affirms that the antithesis of v14 is the key which unlocks the passage. We have sought to show that a wider approach to the problems of 7:7-25 is required.



than is sometimes granted him. He was under pressure from his Gentile and pagan contacts and this may well have made him aware of the wider issue at stake and forced him to think in broader terms.

We have found that the Epistle as a whole has a very definite confessional element, yet we can find no "confessio" in 7:7-25. This however presents no problem. A definite issue is under analysis, namely, the role of the law in the saving purpose of God. A particular form has been chosen for its presentation, namely the dramatisation. The two together account for the insertion of a non-confessional passage within the larger confessional whole.

We have also examined the milieu from which the Epistle was written on the principle that product and source are closely related. There are two aspects to this background, one which is internal to Paul and another which is external lying in the historical and Church situation. Both are important and they interact. We have also examined the connections of the passage within the Epistle. 7:7-25 does not stand on its own but is part of the whole, which is so closely knit together that no one part can be properly considered apart from the rest.

The interpretation of 7:7-25 must proceed from a broad base. This base is provided by an appreciation of the dramatic form in which the passage is presented. We submit that the close connection with 5:12ff, the existence of a Genesis allusion, the influence of a model-building mood and the emotional overtones in the vocabulary, all support this inference. The multiple use of the term νεμω which exegesis seems to us to require, accords happily with such a form. The chosen form has

the double advantage that it helps us to answer various questions that arise in the interpretation of the passage but at the same time it also precludes any attempt to answer absurd questions, absurd that is, in the light of the dramatic form although not of course in other contexts.

The five parts - four scenes (vv7-11; vv12-13; vv14-24; v25a) and the summarising conclusion (v25b) - can be clearly recognised and their inter-relation can be adequately explained without recourse to emendation or rearrangement. It is very important to appreciate the change in idiom in Scene Three and also the two conflicts - the one set within the other - which lie behind it. This recognition enables us in turn to deal satisfactorily with the celebrated anthropological problems to which the verses give rise, while at the same time we can preserve the unity of the passage.

If we are to state precisely the meaning of 7:7-25 we must be able to answer certain questions and answer them moreover in a way that is agreeable to an exegesis which appreciates the detailed structure within the specific literary form. The questions are:

1. Who is the εὐω ? We answer in the broadest terms - mankind apart from Jesus Christ.
2. Can the εὐω be given a Christian reference? At the outset of our investigation we held that it was so, but examination of the issues involved (in particular exegetical issues) has compelled a change of mind and we have therefore to answer - no! both content and context forbid it.
3. How does the passage relate to Paul himself? We have sought to

show that it is not autobiographical. The writer occupies an objective position in relation to his material.

4. How does the passage appear in the light of Paul's primary Christological experience and understanding? We hold that Paul was forced into the position over against the law which he occupies in this passage, by the fact of his encounter with Jesus Christ and his consequent appreciation of the implications of that encounter. He makes a Christological critique of the law.

5. It is important, and this is as near as we can come to any so-called "key" to 7:7-25, to grasp the eschatological point of balance in the thought behind the analysis. We are then able to affirm that the passage is not about the Christian but the Christian is nevertheless able to learn from it. We are also able to assert that it is not about Paul himself yet Paul is not totally unrelated to the passage. The words "but" and "yet", point to the fundamental paradox.

"The stage", said Anton Chekov,<sup>1</sup> "is the scaffold on which the playwright is executed". His dictum was in response to misunderstanding of the Russian dramatist's intentions. What the stage is to the play in this aphorism, interpretation is to Paul's dramatisation in 7:7-25. May we not say that the Apostle has suffered from misinterpretation of his work by those who have failed to grasp the dramatic form of his presentation and the structure which is designed in accordance with that form? This form and this structure, chosen by Paul to serve his controlling purpose of elucidating the part played by the law in God's purpose, together

---

1. Quoted Allen Wright, dramatic critic, "Scotsman" newspaper, 10:6:72.

illumine the meaning of the passage, Whatever measure of agreement may be obtained on the questions at issue, it is certainly true that we are dealing here with one of the most difficult texts and one of the most celebrated and long-standing controversies in Pauline studies. Recognition of the fact runs like a refrain through the literature.<sup>1.</sup>

Finally, we sum up the main advantages as we see them which result from understanding the Εὐχ of 7:7ff as part of a dramatic whole.

1. We do full justice to the generally recognised personification of sin and death when we think of a dramatisation. If we stop short at the idea of personification without acknowledging the dramatic presentation in its entirety, then we impoverish our understanding of the passage. We have faced in the right direction but have not proceeded nearly far enough.

2. We preserve the unity of the passage.

3. We can account adequately for the change in style of presentation in vv14ff, when we recognise a change of scene in which the portrayal takes the form of a soliloquy. We are unaware of any interpretation of the passage which has proposed this insight.

4. We can account adequately for the change to the present tenses from v14 on. It is a "dramatic present" employed by the "I", which is interiorising the situation previously presented differently as an onstage encounter of the characters.

5. We avoid mistaken and irrelevant questions which do not take account of the dramatic form of portrayal, as for instance the question,

---

1. H. Windisch, "The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount", 1951, p.122 remarks that Rom. 7 has no parallel elsewhere in the whole Bible.

"when?" applied to <sup>21</sup>εἶς and <sup>21</sup>ἀνὴρ εἶς in vv9-10. P. Benoit<sup>1</sup> writes with perception when he warns that we dull and falsify the dramatic presentation when we insist on translating it too strictly into logical terms.

6. We have no difficulty in admitting a Genesis reference and in recognising a salvation history scheme of thought.

7. We can reject an explicit autobiographical reference, yet at the same time we do not disconnect Paul the playwright completely from his literary creation.

8. We can allow the double reference to a positive theme which is introduced by the anticipatory v25a, as well as the negative theme, without any necessity for rearranging the text. It is quite wrong to suggest that the non-autobiographical view must rearrange the text.

9. We can account for the emotional overtones in vv14ff and in particular in v24. These reflect the anguish of the human situation dramatically reproduced.

10. We can resolve the anthropological problem in vv14ff by giving weight to the dramatic form in which an internalising of the action in the previous two scenes takes place within the "I". The borrowed terms that are used must be understood against this background and not as if they came straight from a text-book on Logic or Psychology.

11. This understanding was within reach of the first readers.

12. We are able to avoid a false concept of consistency. We are in fact being consistent in our interpretation in the only way that matters,

---

1. op. cit., p.493.

which is within the dramatic logic of the passage itself. We let the passage set its own canons.

13. We can make glad use of contributions to the discussion, such as those of W.G. Kummel and R. Bultmann, to name once more the two writers whom we consider to be pre-eminent in this field, as well as the lesser ones such as P. Benoit, G. Bornkamm, J. Kürzinger, C.L. Mitton, J. Blank, K. Kertelge, K.G. Kuhn, K. Stendahl and others.

14. We employed the phrase "creative synthesis" to describe the Epistle as a whole. 7:7-25 is an excellent illustration of this definition.<sup>1</sup> The creative element is well seen in the contrivance of a literary form which is very unusual both for Paul and for the Hebrew culture, and also in the theological reinterpretation of the function of the law. The synthesising element is present in as far as the "building materials" - vocabulary, theological concepts, general standpoint - are derived from the past of Paul, of the primitive Church, of Judaism, and of the Hellenistic world, and in that order of importance.

---

1. J. Blank, op. cit., p.12 n2, recognises the synthesising which takes place in Rom.7. He distinguishes six constituents which interlock in the presentation: a salvation history view of sin and law; ideas from Jewish anthropology; a reassessment of the law; Paul's personal experience; the influence of hellenistic ethics; a new theological anthropology.



BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Albright, W.F. "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible".  
Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,  
140 (Dec. 1955), 27ff.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament. Vol. 2.  
London: Rivingtons and Cambridge: Deighton, Bell  
and Co., fifth edition 1865.
- Althaus, P. Der Brief an die Römer.  
Das Neue Testament Deutsch. 6.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, neunte  
Auflage 1959.
- " " "Reply to A. Nygren".  
Theologische Literaturzeitung, 8 (1958), Col.475-480.
- " " Paulus und Luther über den Menschen.  
Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, vierte Auflage  
1963.
- Anderson, H. "The Historical Paul".  
New College Bulletin, 4 (Spring 1968), 2, 5-19.
- Arndt, W.F.  
and  
Gingrich, F.W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and  
Other Early Christian Literature.  
A translation and adaptation of W. Bauer,  
Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften  
des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen  
Literatur, fourth edition 1952.  
University of Chicago Press and Cambridge  
University Press, 1957.
- Bandstra, A.J. The Law and the Elements of the World.  
An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching.  
Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1964.
- Barbour, G.F. The Life of Alexander Whyte, D.D.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, eighth edition, 1925.
- Barclay, W. The Epistle to the Romans.  
The Daily Study Bible.  
Edinburgh: Church of Scotland, no date.
- " " The Mind of St. Paul.  
London: Collins, 1958.
- " " Flesh and Spirit: An Examination of Galatians  
5:19-23.  
London: Religious Book Club 147, 1962.

- Barr, J. The Semantics of Biblical Language.  
Oxford: University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C.K. "New Testament Eschatology. 1. Jewish and Pauline Eschatology".  
S.J.T., 6 (1953), 136-155.
- " " "New Testament Eschatology. 2. The Gospels".  
S.J.T., 6 (1953), 225-243.
- " " A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.  
Black's New Testament Commentaries.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957, reprinted with minor changes 1962.
- " " From First Adam to Last.  
A Study in Pauline Theology.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.
- " " A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.  
Black's New Testament Commentaries.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1968.
- " " New Testament Essays.  
London: S.P.C.K., 1972.
- Barth, K. The Epistle to the Romans.  
trans. E.C. Hoskyns (Der Römerbrief, sixth edition)  
Oxford: University Press., 1933.
- " " A Shorter Commentary on Romans.  
trans. D.H. van Daalen (Kurze Erklärung des Römerbrief,  
Munich, 1956).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1959.
- " " "All: A Sermon".  
trans. D.G. Miller.  
Interpretation, 14 (1960), 64-69.
- Batey, R. "So All Israel will be Saved".  
An Interpretation of Romans 11:25-32.  
Interpretation, 20 (1966), 218-228.
- Baumgartel, F. Kapōia, T.D.N.T., 3, pp.605-613.  
Behm, J.
- Baur, F.C. Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Works,  
his Epistles and his Doctrine.  
trans. E. Zeller, second edition revised A. Menzies,  
London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1876.

- Behm, J. ε60, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.698-699.
- " " voos, T.D.N.T., 4, pp.951-960.
- Benoit, P. "La Loi et la Croix d'après Saint Paul. (Rom.VII, 7-VIII,4)".  
R.B., 47 (1938), 481-509.
- Bengel, J.A. Gnomon of the New Testament. Vol. 3.  
revised and edited A.R. Fausset.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1857.
- Best, E. The Letter of Paul to the Romans.  
The Cambridge Bible Commentary.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Billerbeck, P. Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 3.  
Strack, H.L. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Black, M. The Scrolls and Christian Origins.  
Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament.  
London; Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1961.
- Black, M. Peake's Commentary on the Bible.  
Rowley, H.H. London: Nelson, 1962.  
editors.
- Black, M. The Scrolls and Christianity.  
editor Historical and Theological Significance.  
Theological Collections. 11.  
London: S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Blank, J. "Der gespaltene Mensch. Zur Exegese von Röm 7,7-25".  
Bibel und Leben, 1968, 10-20.
- Blaser, P. Das Gesetz bei Paulus.  
Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. 19, Band 1.  
Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1941.
- Blass, F. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other  
Debrunner, A. Early Christian Literature.  
Funk, R.W. A translation and Revision of the ninth-tenth German  
edition incorporating supplementary notes of  
A. Debrunner by R.W. Funk.  
Chicago: University Press, 1961.

- Bornkamm, G. Early Christian Experience.  
The New Testament Library.  
 trans. P.L. Hammer (Das Ende des Gesetzes, Munich, 1966;  
 Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, München, 1963)  
 London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1969.
- " " "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament".  
 Australian Biblical Review, XI (1963), 2-14.
- " " Paul.  
 trans. D.M.G. Stalker (Paulus, Stuttgart, 1969).  
 London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.
- Bouttier, M. Christianity According to Paul.  
Studies in Biblical Theology. 49.  
 trans. F. Clark (Le condition chretien selon saint Paul,  
 Geneva, 1964.)  
 London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1966.
- Braun, H. Qumran und das Neue Testament. 2 Vols.  
 Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.
- " " "Römer 7,7-25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-  
 Frommen".  
 Z.TH.K., 56 (1959), 1-18.
- Bring, R. Commentary on Galatians.  
 Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- " " "The Message to the Gentiles". A Study to the  
 Theology of Paul the Apostle.  
 Studia Theologica, 19-20 (1965-66), 30-46.
- Brown, R.E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament (Second  
 Thoughts)".  
 The Expository Times, 78 (1966-67), 19-23.
- Bruce, F.F. The Acts of the Apostles.  
 London: Tyndale Press, second edition 1952.
- " " "Qumran and Early Christianity".  
 N.T.S., 2 (1955-56), 176-190.
- " " The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.  
An Introduction and Commentary.  
 Tyndale New Testament Commentaries.  
 London: The Tyndale Press, 1963.

- Bruce, F.F. "St. Paul in Rome".  
B.J.R.L., 46 (1963-4), 326-345.
- " " Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls.  
Exeter: The Paternoster Press, paperback 1966.
- " " The English Bible.  
A History of Translations from the earliest English Versions to the New English Bible.  
London: Lutterworth Press, new and revised edition, 1970.
- Brunner, E. The Mediator.  
London: Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- " " The Letter to the Romans.  
A Commentary.  
trans. H.A. Kennedy (Der Römerbrief, Kassel, 1956).  
London: Lutterworth Press, 1959.
- Buber, M. Werke. Erster Band.  
Heidelberg.: Verlag Lambert Schneider; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1962.
- Bultmann, R. Neuwerk, T.D.N.T., 1, pp.689, 714.
- " " Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe.  
Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Heft 13.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.
- " " "Glossen im Römerbrief".  
Theologische Literaturzeitung, 72 (1947), 197-202.
- " " Essays: Philosophical and Theological.  
trans. J.C.G. Greig (Glauben und Verstehen 2, Tübingen, 1952)  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1955.
- " " Existence and Faith.  
Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann, selected, translated and introduced by S.M. Ogden.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1961.
- " " Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 1.  
trans. K. Grobel (Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1953).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1965.

- Bultmann, R. The Old and New Man in the Letters of Paul.  
trans. K.R. Crim (Der alte und der neue Mensch in der Theologie des Paulus, Darmstadt, 1964).  
Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967.
- " " Exegetica.  
Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments, ausgewählt, eingeleitet und herausgegeben von E. Dinkler.  
Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967.
- Burton, E.de W. The Epistle to the Galatians.  
International Critical Commentary.  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. *A Eng. Ed.*
- Buttrick, G.A.  
editor The Interpreter's Bible.  
Vol. 7:1951. Vol.9:1954.  
New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.
- " " Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 3.  
New York and Nashville: Abindon Press, 1962.
- Caird, G.B. The Apostolic Age.  
Studies in Theology.  
London: Gerald Duckworth and Company Limited. 1955.
- " " Principalities and Powers.  
A Study in Pauline Theology.  
The Chancellor's Lectures for 1954, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.  
Oxford: University Press, 1956.
- Calvin, J. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians.  
Calvin's Commentaries: trans. R. MacKenzie, edited D. and T.F. Torrance.  
Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Cambier, J. L'Évangile de Dieu selon l'Épître aux Romains. 1.  
Studia Neotestamentica. Studia III.  
Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- Carrington, P. The Primitive Christian Catechism.  
A Study in the Epistles.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1940.
- Cave, S. "After Fifty Years. VIII. The Significance of the Apostle Paul".  
The Expository Times, 50 (1938-9), 452-460.



- Cave, S. The Gospel of St. Paul.  
A Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of  
his Age and Modern Missionary Experience.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- Cerfaux, L. The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul.  
trans. L. Soiron (Le Chrétien dans la Théologie  
Paulinienne, Paris, 1962).  
London: G. Chapman Ltd., 1967.
- Charles, R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old  
Testament in English.  
Vol.1. Apocrypha.  
Vol.2. Pseudepigrapha.  
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Charlesworth, J.H. "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in LQS III,  
13-IV, 26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Fourth  
Gospel".  
N.T.S., 15 (1968-9), 389-418.
- Cole, L.E. General Psychology.  
New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1939.
- Conzelmann, H. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament.  
trans. J. Bowden (Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen  
Testaments, München, 1968).  
London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1969.
- Cox, D. Jung and St. Paul.  
A Study of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith  
and its Relation to the Concept of Individuation.  
London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1959.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. "St. Paul and the Law".  
S.J.T., 17 (1964), 43-68.
- " " A. Commentary on Romans 12-13.  
S.J.T. Occasional Papers No.12.  
Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.
- Cullmann, O. The Christology of the New Testament.  
trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall (Die Christologie  
des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1957).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1959.

- Cullmann, O. Salvation in History.  
The New Testament Library.  
trans. S.C. Sowers and others (Heil als Geschichte:  
Heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament,  
Tübingen, 1965).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1967.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.  
Jordan Lectures 1952.  
London: The Athlone Press, University of London, 1956.
- Davies, D.M. "Free From the Law".  
An Exposition of the Seventh Chapter of Romans.  
Interpretation, 7 (1953), 156-162.
- Davies, W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism.  
Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology.  
London: S.P.C.K., second edition with additional  
notes, 1955.
- " " "Review: 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte. J. Munck'.  
N.T.S., 2 (1955-56), 60-72.
- " " Christian Origins and Judaism.  
London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.
- Dean, J.T. St. Paul and Corinth.  
London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.
- Deissmann, A. St. Paul.  
A Study in Social and Religious History.  
trans. L.R.M. Strachan.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.
- Denney, J. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.  
Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol.2 pp.557-725.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1900.
- " " "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans".  
The Expositor, 6th. Series, 3 and 4, 1901.  
Vol.3: pp.1-14; 172-181; 283-295; 433-450.  
Vol.4: pp.81-95; 299-311; 422-436.
- Derrett, J.D.M. Law in the New Testament.  
London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970.
- Dibelius, M. Paul.  
(ed. W.G. Kummel) trans. F. Clarke.  
London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.

- Dodd, C.H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.  
The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.  
 London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- " " The Bible and the Greeks.  
 London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- " " History and the Gospel.  
 London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1938.
- " " "The Foundations of Christian Theology".  
 Theology To-Day, 7 (1950-51), 308-320.
- " " The Old Testament in the New.  
The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 1952.  
 London: The Athlone Press, 1952.
- " " According to the Scriptures.  
The sub-structure of New Testament Theology.  
 London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1952.
- " " Gospel and Law.  
The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity.  
 Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- " " The Meaning of Paul for To-Day.  
 Collins, Fontana Books, 1958 (first published Allen  
 and Unwin, Ltd., 1920).
- " " New Testament Studies.  
 Manchester: University Press, reprinted with minor  
 corrections, 1967.
- Douglas, J.D. The New Bible Dictionary.  
 London: Tyndale Fellowship, 1962.
- Dulmen, A. van Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus.  
Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien. 5.  
 Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- Duncan, G.S. "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered: VI. Were Paul's  
 Imprisonment Epistles Written from Ephesus?"  
 The Expository Times, 67 (1955-56), 163-166.
- Dupont, J. "La Problem de la Structure Litteraire de L'Épître  
 aux Romains".  
 R.B., 62 (1955), 365-397.

- Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit.  
Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 15.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1970.
- Ellis, E.E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament.  
London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- " " Paul and his Recent Interpreters.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing  
Company, 1961.
- " " "Paul and his Co-Workers".  
N.T.S., 17 (1970-71), 437-452.
- Ellison, H.I. The Mystery of Israel.  
An Exposition of Romans 9-11.  
Exeter: Paternoster Press, revised and enlarged  
edition, 1968.
- Ellwein, E. "Das Rätsel von Römer VII".  
Kerugma und Dogma, 1 (1955), 247-268.
- Epstein, I.  
editor The Babylonian Talmud.  
London: Soncino Press, Seder Nezikin Vill, 1935.  
Seder Zera'im, 1, 1948.  
Seder Nezikin VII, 1935.  
Seder Mo'ed II, 1938.  
Seder Nashim II, 1936.
- Evans, C.F.  
Hooker, M.  
O'Neill, J.C. The Apostle Paul.  
London: B.B.C., 1966.
- Ewen, D. Leonard Bernstein.  
London: W.H. Allen, 1967.
- Fahy, T. "St. Paul's Romans were Jewish Converts".  
Irish Theological Quarterly, 26 (1959), 182-191.
- Fairweather, W. The Background of the Gospels.  
Cunningham Lectures Twentieth Series.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, fourth edition 1926.
- " " The Background of the Epistles.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1935.
- Farmer, W.R.  
Moule, C.F.D.  
Niehuhr, R.R.  
editors. Christian History and Interpretation: Studies  
Presented to John Knox.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

- Fennon, P. "Some Trends in British Pauline Theology".  
*Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, Studiorum Paulinorum  
 Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961. 1.  
 Rome:1963.
- Feuillet, A. "Le Plan Salvifique de Dieu d'après l'Épître aux  
 Romains".  
*R.B.*, 57 (1950), 336-387.
- Foakes Jackson, F.J. The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. 5  
 Lake, K. Part 1. The Acts of the Apostles.  
 London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1933.
- Foerster, W. Evangelium, T.D.N.T., 7, pp.151-163.
- Fordham, F. An Introduction to Jung's Psychology.  
 Pelican Books A273.  
 Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., new edition 1959.
- Fraser, J.W. "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: 11 Corinthians V.16  
 Once More".  
*N.T.S.*, 17 (1971), 293-313.
- Friedrich, G. "Das Gesetz des Glaubens Rom. 3,27"  
*Theologische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1954), 401-417.
- Fuchs, E. Die Freiheit des Glaubens.  
 Römer 5-8 ausgelegt.  
 Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie. Band 14.  
 München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1949.
- " " "Existentielle Interpretation von Römer 7,7-12 und  
 21-23".  
*Z.Th.K.*, 59 (1962), 285-314.
- Furnish, V.P. "The Jesus-Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann".  
*B.J.R.L.*, 47 (1965), 342-371.
- Garvie, A.E. Romans.  
The Century Bible. Vol.3.  
 London: The Caxton Publishing Company, 1902.
- " " "Studies in the Pauline Theology".  
*The Expositor*, 7th Series, 7 and 8, 1909.  
 Vol.7: pp.30-41; 126-138; 241-254; 333-346; 508-521.  
 Vol.8: pp.33-48; 130-143; 231-244; 325-338; 417-431;  
 542-556.

- Gaugler, E. Der Römerbrief. 1. Teil  
Prophezei, Schweizerisches Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde.  
Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945.
- Gifford, E.H. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.  
London: John Murray, 1886.
- Glover, T.R. Paul of Tarsus.  
London: S.C.M., 1925.
- Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.  
2 Vols. trans. A. Cusin.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1893.
- Goguel, M. The Birth of Christianity.  
trans. H.C. Snape (La naissance du Christianisme,  
Paris, 1946).  
London: Allen and Unwin, 1953.
- Goodspeed, E.J. "Phoebe's Letter of Introduction".  
H.T.R., 44 (1951), 55-57.
- Goppelt, L. Jesus, Paul and Judaism.  
An Introduction to New Testament Theology.  
trans. and ed. E. Schroeder (Christentum und Judentum  
im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert, ein Aufriss der  
Urgeschichte der Kirche, Gütersloh, 1954).  
New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1964.
- Gore, C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.  
A Practical Exposition.  
Vol.1. 1900. Vol.2. 1901.  
London: John Murray.
- Grant, F.C. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament.  
Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Grant, R.M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament.  
London: Collins, 1963.
- Grayston, K. "'Not Ashamed of the Gospel'. Romans 1,16a and the  
Structure of the Epistle".  
Texte und Untersuchungen. 87. Studia Evangelica 2.  
(1964), 569-573.
- Griffith, A.L. The Roman Letter To-Day.  
London: Lutterworth, 1960.



- Grimm, C.L.W.  
Thayer, J.H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, fourth edition 1901.
- Grundmann, W. "Gesetz, Rechtfertigung und Mystik bei Paulus".  
Z.N.T.W., 32 (1933), 52-65.
- Gulin, E.G. "The Positive Meaning of the Law According to Paul".  
Lutheran Quarterly, 10 (May 1958), 115-128.
- Gutbrod, W. Die Paulinischen Anthropologie.  
Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A. und N. Testament.  
Hefte 15-16.  
Stuttgart-Berlin: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934.
- Gutbrod, W.H. "Jesus and the Law - Some Considerations".  
Theology, 39 (July-Dec.1939), 123-127.
- Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles.  
London: Tyndale Press, second edition 1963.
- Gutjahr, F.C. Der Brief an die Römer. Erste Hälfte.  
Graz und Viena: Verlagsbuchhandlung Styria, 1923.
- Haenchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles.  
trans. B. Noble and G. Shinn under H. Anderson,  
revised R. McL. Wilson, from the 14th German edition,  
Göttingen, 1965).  
Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Halliday, W.R. The Pagan Background of Early Christianity.  
Liverpool: University Press; London: Hodder and  
Stoughton, 1925.
- Harder, G. "Der Konkrete Anlass des Römerbriefes".  
Theologia Viatorum, 6 (1954), 13-24.
- Hastings, J.  
editor Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 3.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.
- " " A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Vol. 2.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913.
- Heikinnen, J.W. "The Interpreter at Work. XIII. Luther's Lectures  
on the Romans (1515-1516)".  
Interpretation, 7(1953), 178-194.
- Hawkins, R.M. "Romans: A Reinterpretation".  
J.B.L., 60 (1941), 129-140.

- Hesse, H. The Glass Bead Game.  
trans. R. and C. Wirston (Das Glasperlenspiel, 1943)  
Penguin Books, 1972.
- Higgins, A.J.B.  
editor New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas  
Walter Manson 1893-1958. Manchester: University Press,  
1959.
- Hofman, J.C.K. von Die Heilige Schrift. Neuen Testaments Band 3.  
Nordlingen: Beck, dritte Theil 1868.
- Hommel, H. "Das 7. Kapitel des Römerbriefes im Licht Antiker  
Überlieferung".  
Theologia Viatorum, 8 (1961-2), 90-116.
- Hooker, M.D. "Adam in Romans 1".  
N.T.S., 6 (1959-60), 297-306.
- Howard, G.E. "Christ the End of the Law; The Meaning of Romans  
10,4ff".  
J.B.L., 88 (1969), 331-337.
- Howell, E. "St. Paul and the Greek World".  
Expository Times, 71 (1960), 328-332.
- Hunter, A.M. Interpreting the New Testament. 1900-1950.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1951.
- " " Interpreting Paul's Gospel.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1954.
- " " The Epistle to the Romans.  
Introduction and Commentary. The Torch Bible  
Commentaries.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1955.
- " " Introducing New Testament Theology.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1957.
- " " Paul and his Predecessors.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., new revised edition, 1961.
- " " Teaching and Preaching the New Testament.  
The Preacher's Library.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1963.
- Hurd, J.C. Jr. The Origin of 1 Corinthians.  
London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Inge, W.R. Outspoken Essays. (First Series).  
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1919.

- Inglis, G.J. "St. Paul's Conversion in his Epistles".  
Theology, 34 (1937), 214-228.
- James, W. The Varieties of Religious Experience.  
A Study in Human Nature.  
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902.
- Jarrell, W.A. "Romans 7:7-25, The Experience of Sinners".  
The Review and Expositor, 5 (1908), 586-597.
- Jeremias, J. "The Key to Pauline Theology".  
The Expository Times, 76 (1964-5), 27-30.
- Johnson, S.E. The Joy of Study.  
In Honour of F.C. Grant.  
New York: MacMillan, 1951.
- Johnson, S.E. "Paul and the Manual of Discipline".  
H.T.R., 48 (1955), 157-165.
- Jones, A., editor The Jerusalem Bible.  
London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966.
- Julicher, A. An Introduction to the New Testament.  
trans. J.P. Ward (Einleitung in das Neue Testament,  
Tübingen, 1906, 5-6. Auflage).  
London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1904.
- " " Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Zweiter Band.  
Der Brief an die Römer. pp.223ff.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917.
- Jung, C.J. Contributions to Analytical Psychology.  
International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and  
Scientific Method.  
Trans. H.G. and C.F. Baynes.  
London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd., 1928.
- Kasemann, E. Perspectives on Paul.  
The New Testament Library.  
trans. M. Kohl (Paulinische Perspektiven, Tübingen,  
1969).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1971.
- Katzenmayer, H. "Entstehung und erste Schicksale der Kirche Gottes  
in Rom".  
Internationale Kirchlische Zeitschrift. (1941), 36-45.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- " " St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things.  
The Cunningham Lectures for 1904.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.

- Kepler, T.S.  
editor  
Contemporary Thinking About Paul.  
An Anthology  
New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.  
1950.
- Kertelge, K.  
"Exegetische Überlegungen zum Verständnis der  
paulinischen Anthropologie nach Römer 7".  
Z.N.T.W., 62 (1971), 105-114.
- " "  
The Epistle to the Romans.  
trans. F. McDonagh (Der Brief an die Römer,  
Dusseldorf, 1971).  
London and Sydney: Sheed and Ward, 1972.
- Keuck, W.  
"Dienst des Geistes und des Fleisches".  
Zur Auslegungsgeschichte und Auslegung von Rm 7,25b".  
Theologische Quartalschrift, 142 (1961), 257-286.
- Kinoshita, J.  
"Romans - Two Writings Combined".  
A New Interpretation of the Body of Romans".  
Novum Testamentum, 7 (1964), 258-277.
- Kirk, K.E.  
The Epistle to the Romans.  
In the Revised Version. The Clarendon Bible.  
Oxford: 1937.
- Kittel, G.  
Friedrich, G.  
editors  
Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.  
Vols. 1-4: G. Kittel  
Vols. 5-7: G. Friedrich.  
trans. and ed. G.W. Bromiley  
London and Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans  
Publishing Company.
- Klausner, J.  
From Jesus to Paul.  
trans. from the Hebrew, W.F. Stinespring.  
New York: The MacMillan Company, 1944.
- Kleinknecht, H.  
Gutbrod, W.  
Law. Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's T.W.N.T.  
trans. D.M. Barton, ed. P.R. Ackroyd.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.
- Klijn, A.F.J.  
An Introduction to the New Testament.  
trans. from the Dutch, M. van der Vathorst Smit, 1965.  
Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Knight, G.A.F.  
Law and Grace.  
Must a Christian Keep the Law of Moses?  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1962.

- Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul.  
New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.
- " " "A Note on the Text of Romans".  
N.T.S., 2 (1955-6), 191-193.
- Knox, W.L. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- Kroeber, A.L. "Stimulus Diffusion".  
American Anthropologist, New Series 42, (Jan.-March 1940), 1-20.
- Kühl, E. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.  
Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1913.
- Kummel, W.G. Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus.  
Untersuchungen zum N.T., herausgegeben von H. Windisch. Heft 17.  
Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929.
- " " Introduction to the New Testament.  
trans. A.J. Mattill, Jr. (Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Heidelberg, 1965, Feine-Behm 14th. revised edition).  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1966.
- " " Man in the New Testament.  
trans. J.J. Vincent (Das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament, Zurich, 1948).  
London: Epworth Press, revised edition, 1963.
- Kürzinger, J. "Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis von Römer 7".  
Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge 7-8 (1963-4), 270-274.
- Kuss, O. Der Römerbrief. 2 Vol's. 9  
Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, zweite Auflage, 1963.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Saint Paul: Epître aux Romains.  
Études Bibliques.  
Paris: J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>., 1950.
- Lake, K. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.  
London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- Leenhardt, F.J. The Epistle to the Romans.  
trans. H. Knight (L'Épître de saint Paul aux Romains, Neuchâtel et Paris, 1957).  
London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.

- Lekkerkerker, A.F.N. Romer 7 und Romer 9 bei Augustin.  
Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1942.
- Levison, L. Life of St. Paul.  
London, Edinburgh and New York: Marshall Brothers Ltd., third edition, no date (c.1924).
- Lewis, C.S. Screwtape Proposes a Toast.  
And Other Pieces.  
Collins, Fontana Books, 1965.
- Lewis, E. "A Christian Theodicy".  
An Exposition of Romans 8:18-39.  
Interpretation, XI (1957), 405-420.
- Lietzmann, H. The Beginnings of the Christian Church.  
International Library of Christian Knowledge. 2.  
trans. B.L. Woolf.  
London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson Limited, 1937.
- " " An Die Romer.  
Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. 8.  
Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck),  
dritte Auflage 1928.
- Lightfoot, J.B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.  
London and Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1873.
- " " St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon.  
London: MacMillan and Co., 1875.
- " " Biblical Essays.  
London: MacMillan and Company, 1893.
- " " Notes on Epistles of Paul.  
London: MacMillan and Company, 1895.
- Lillie, W. The Law of Christ.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1956.
- Longenecker, R.N. Paul Apostle of Liberty.  
London and New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Luther, M. Works of Martin Luther. Vol. 6.  
trans. and ed. C.M. Jacobs.  
Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1932.
- " " Luther: Lectures on Romans.  
The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. 15.  
trans. and ed. W. Pauck.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1961.
- Luthi, W. The Letter to the Romans.  
An Exposition. trans. K. Schoenenberger.  
Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.



- Luz, U. Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus.  
Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. Band 49.  
München: Kaiser Verlag, 1968.
- " " "Zum Aufbau von Rom. 1-8".  
Theologische Zeitschrift, 25 (1969), 161-181.
- Lyonnet, S. "Note sur le Plan de l'Épître aux Romains".  
Recherches de Science Religieuse, 39-40 (1951-2),  
301-316.
- " " "L'Histoire du Salut selon le Chapitre VII de  
l'Épître aux Romains."  
Biblica, 43 (1962), 117-151.
- McKenzie, J.G. Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism.  
London: Allen and Unwin, 1940.
- " " Guilt: Its Meaning and Significance.  
London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1962.
- Machen, J.G. The Origin of Paul's Religion.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921.
- Manson, T.W. Ethics and the Gospel.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1960.
- Manson, T.W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles.  
(Black M., editor) Manchester: University Press, 1962.
- Manson, T.W. On Paul and John.  
Some Selected Theological Themes. Studies in  
Biblical Theology 38, ed. M. Black.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1963.
- " " "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Problem of the Epistle to  
the Galatians".  
B.J.R.L., 24 (April 1940), 1.
- Manson, W. The Epistle to the Hebrews.  
An Historical and Theological Reconsideration.  
The Baird Lecture for 1949.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
- " " Jesus and the Christian.  
London: James Clarke and Co. Ltd., 1967.
- Marxsen, W. Introduction to the New Testament.  
An approach to its problems.  
trans. G. Buswell (Einleitung in das Neue Testament,  
Gütersloh, 1964).  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.

- Maurat, C. The Brontës' Secret.  
trans. M. Meldrum from the French.  
London: Constable, 1969.
- Menoud, P.H. "Revelation and Tradition".  
The Influence of Paul's Conversion on his Theology.  
Interpretation, 7 (1953), 131-141.
- Metzger, B.M. Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul.  
New Testament Tools and Studies. Vol. 1.  
Leiden: second edition 1970;
- " " The New Testament: its background, growth and content.  
New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.  
(London: Lutterworth Press, 1969).
- Michel, O. Der Brief an die Römer.  
Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue  
Testament.  
13. Auflage.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.
- Minear, P.S. "The Truth about Sin and Death".  
The Meaning of Atonement in the Epistle to the Romans.  
Interpretation, 7 (1953), 142-155.
- " " The Obedience of Faith.  
The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.  
Studies in Biblical Theology, second series 19.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1971.
- Mitton, C.L. "Romans vii Reconsidered".  
Expository Times, 65 (1953-54), 78-81; 99-103;  
132-135.
- Modalsli, O. "Gal. 2, 19-21; 5, 16-18 und Rom. 7, 7-25".  
Theologische Zeitschrift, 21 (1965), 22-37.
- Moller, H. "Römer 7 ist und bleibt das Bild des Christen".  
Deutsche Theologie, 6 (1939), 5-27; 68-79.
- Moore, G.F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.  
The Age of the Tannaim. Vol. 1.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Morpurgo, J.E. Barnes Wallis: A Biography.  
London: Longman, 1972.

- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek.  
Cambridge: University Press, second edition, 1960.
- " " The Birth of the New Testament.  
Black's New Testament Commentaries. Companion Vol. 1.  
London: Black, 1962.
- Moule, H.C.G. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.  
Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1903.
- Moulton, J.H.  
Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.  
Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary  
sources.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Muller, F. "Zwei Marginalien im Brief des Paulus an die Römer."  
Z.N.T.W., 39-40 (1940-41), 249-254.
- Munck, J. "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve".  
Studia Theologica, 3-4 (1949-50), 96-110.
- " " "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament".  
J.T.S., New Series 2 (1951), 3-16.
- " " Paul and the Salvation of Mankind.  
trans. F. Clarke (Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte,  
Copenhagen, 1954).  
Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959.
- " " "Christ and Israel.  
An Interpretation of Romans 9-11.  
trans. I. Nixon from the Danish.  
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- " " The Acts of the Apostles.  
The Anchor Bible.  
revised W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann.  
New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1967.
- Murphy, R.E. "BSR in the Qumran Literature and SARKS in the  
Epistle to the Romans".  
Sacra Pagina, 11 (1959), 60-76.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.  
editor Paul and Qumran.  
London: G. Chapman, 1968.

- Murray, J. The Epistle to the Romans.  
The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. The New London Commentary on the New Testament.  
London and Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, One Vol. edition 1967;
- Nelson, W.R. "Pauline Anthropology".  
Its Relation to Christ and his Church.  
Interpretation, 14 (1960), 14-27.
- Nickle, K.F. The Collection.  
A Study in Paul's Strategy.  
Studies in Biblical Theology. 48.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1966.
- Niesel, W. Reformed Symbolics.  
A Comparison of Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Protestantism. trans. D. Lewis (Das Evangelium und die Kirche, Neukirchen, 1960).  
Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Noack, B. "Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans".  
Studia Theologica, 19-20 (1965-66), 155-166.
- Nock, A.D. St. Paul.  
The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. 186.  
London: Thornton Butterworth Limited, 1938.
- Nygren, A. Commentary on Romans.  
trans. C.C. Rasmussen from the Swedish, 1944.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1952.
- " " "Objektives und Personliches im Römerbrief".  
Theologische Literaturzeitung, 10 (1952), Col.591-596.
- Oepke, A. EV, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.537-543.
- Ogg, G. The Chronology of the Life of Paul.  
London: Epworth Press, 1968.
- Packer, J.I. "The 'Wretched Man' in Romans 7".  
Texte und Untersuchungen, 87. Studia Evangelica 2. (1964), 621-627.
- Pallis, A. To the Romans.  
Liverpool: The Liverpool Booksellers' Company Ltd., 1920.

- Peake, A.S. "The Quintessence of Paulinism".  
B.J.R.L., 4 (1917-18), 285-311.
- Peursen, A. van Body, Soul, Spirit.  
trans. H.H. Hoskins from the Dutch, 1956, with new material.  
Oxford: University Press, 1966.
- Philip, J. Christian Maturity.  
London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1964.
- La Piana, G. "La Primitiva Comunità Cristiana di Roma e l'Epistola Ai Romani".  
Ricerche Religiose (May-July 1925), 209-226.  
(In translation kindly supplied by Miss Roma Capaldi.)
- " " "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire".  
H.T.R., 20 (1927), 183-403.
- Quanbeck, W. "Theological Reorientation".  
The Thought of the Epistle to the Romans.  
Interpretation, 14 (1960), 259-272.
- Ramm, B. "'The Double' and Romans 7".  
Christianity To-Day, 15 (April 9, 1971), 642-644.
- Ramsay, W.M. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, fifth edition 1900.
- " " The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.
- " " The Cities of St. Paul.  
Their Influence of his Life and Thought. The Cities of Eastern Asia Minor.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.
- Reicke, B. "The Law and This World According to Paul".  
Some Thoughts concerning Gal. 4:1-11.  
J.B.L., 70 (1951), 259-276.
- " " "Body and Soul in the New Testament".  
Studia Theologica, 19-20 (1965-66), 200-212.
- Rengstorff, K.H. "Paulus und die älteste römische Christenheit".  
Texte und Untersuchungen, 87. Studia Evangelica 2. (1964), 447-464.

- Richards, J.R. "Romans and 1 Corinthians: Their Chronological Relationship and Comparative Dates". N.T.S., 13 (1966-67), 14-30.
- Robertson, A.T. A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Robinson, D.W.B. "The Salvation of Israel in Romans 9-11". The Reformed Theological Review, 26 (1967), 81-96.
- Robinson, H.W. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, third edition 1926.
- " " "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality". Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, pp.49-62. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. 60. Herausgegeben von P. Volz, F. Stummer, J. Hempel. Berlin: Verlag von Alfred Topelmann, 1936.
- Robinson, H.W. Record and Revelation. Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Robinson, H.W. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology. Studies in Biblical Theology. 5. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952.
- Robinson, J.M. The Future of our Religious Past. Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann. trans. C.E. Carlstan and R.P. Scharlemann. London: S.C.M. Press, 1971.
- Roosen, A. "Le genre littéraire de l'Épître aux Romains". Texte und Untersuchungen, 87. Studia Evangelica 2. (1964), 465-471.
- Rosenthal, E.I.J. Judaism and Christianity. Vol. 3. Law and Religion. London: Sheldon Press, 1938.



- Roth, C.  
Wigoder, G.  
editors in  
chief  
Encyclopaedia Judaica. Vols. 6 and 15.  
Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd., 1971.
- Sabatier, A.  
The Apostle Paul.  
A Sketch of the Development of his Doctrine.  
trans. A.M. Hellier ed. G.G. Findlay (L'Apôtre Paul,  
Paris, 1881).  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.
- Sanday, W.  
Headlam, A.C.  
A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle  
to the Romans.  
The International Critical Commentary.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, fifth edition 1902.
- Sanders, J.T.  
"Paul's Autobiographical Statements in Galatians 1-2".  
J.B.L., 85 (1966), 335-343.
- Schlatter, A.  
Gottes Gerechtigkeit.  
Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief.  
Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, dritte Auflage, 1959.
- Schmidt, K.L.  
Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag.  
Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1927.
- Schneider, J.  
εὐαγγέλιον, T.D.N.T., 5, pp.191-198.
- Schoeps, H.J.  
Paul.  
The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish  
Religious History.  
trans. H. Knight (Paulus, Tübingen, 1959).  
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Schrenk, G.  
Herntrich, V.  
ἁγία, T.D.N.T., 4, pp.196-214.
- Schrenk, G.  
ἐντολή, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.545-556.
- " "  
δουλοῦ, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.219-223.
- Schweitzer, A.  
Paul and his Interpreters.  
A Critical History.  
trans. W. Montgomery (Geschichte der paulinischen  
Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart,  
Tübingen, 1911).  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912.
- " "  
The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle.  
trans. W. Montgomery (Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus,  
Tübingen, 1930).  
London: A. and C. Black Ltd., 1931.

- Schweizer, E.  
and others      Spirit of God. Bible Key Words from Kittel's T.W.N.T.  
trans. and abbrev. A.E. Harvey.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Anderson Scott, C.A.      Christianity According to St. Paul.  
Cambridge: University Press, 1932.
- Scott, E.F.      The Varieties of New Testament Religion.  
New York: Charles Scribners' and Sons, 1943.
- "      "      Paul's Epistle to the Romans.  
London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1947.
- Sevenster, J.N.  
Unnik, W.C. van      Studia Paulina. In Honorem Johannis De Swaan.  
Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953.
- Shedd, R.P.      Man in Community.  
A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old and Early  
Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity.  
London: The Epworth Press, 1958.
- Shepherd, M.H.  
Johnson, S.E.      Munera Studiosa.  
Cambridge, Mass.: Episcopal Theological School, 1946.
- Slaten, A.W.      "The Qualitative Use of veros in the Pauline  
Epistles".  
American Journal of Theology, 23 (1919), 213-219.
- Smith, C.A.      "The Practical Psychology of St. Paul in the  
Epistle to the Romans".  
The Catholic Bible Quarterly, 10 (1948), 413-428.
- Smith, E.W. Jr.      "The Form and Religious Background of Romans VII:  
24-25a".  
Novum Testamentum, 13 (1971), 127-135.
- Souter, A.      The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of  
St. Paul.  
Oxford: University Press, 1927.
- Stacey, W.D.      The Pauline View of Man.  
London: MacMillan and Co., 1956.
- Stahlin, G.      VCV, T.D.N.T., 4, pp.1106-1123.
- Stange, E.      "Diktierpausen in den Paulusbriefen".  
Z.N.T.W., 18-19 (1917-20), 109-117.

- Stauffer, E. Evw, T.D.N.T., 2, pp.343-362.
- " " Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments.  
E.T. "New Testament Theology", London, 1955.  
Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, vierte Auflage, 1948.
- Stendahl, K. The Scrolls and the New Testament.  
editor London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1958.
- Stendahl, K. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience  
of the West".  
H.T.R., 56 (1963), 199-215.
- Stevens, G.B. The Theology of the New Testament.  
International Theological Library.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, second edition 1906.
- Stewart, J.S. A Man in Christ.  
The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- Stott, J.R.W. Men Made New.  
An Exposition of Romans 5-8.  
London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1966.
- Tasker, R.V.G. The Greek New Testament. Being the Text Translated  
in "The New English Bible" 1961.  
Oxford: University Press and Cambridge: University  
Press, 1964.
- Taylor, T.M. "The Place of Origin of Romans".  
J.B.L., 67 (1948), 281-295.
- Thackeray, H.St.J. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish  
Thought.  
London: MacMillan and Co. Limited, 1900.
- Thomson, G.T. "Exegesis of Romans V-VIII".  
Evangelical Quarterly, 15 (1943), 247-251.  
16 (1944), 4-8; 81-87.
- Thrall, M.E. Greek Particles in the New Testament.  
Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962.
- " " "The Pauline Use of ΣΥΝΕΛΛΕΙΝ".  
N.T.S., 14 (1967-8), 118-125.
- Tillich, P. The Eternal Now. Sermons.  
London: S.C.M. Press, 1963.

- Toussaint, S.D. "The Contrast between the Spiritual Conflict in Romans 7 and Galatians 5". *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 123 (1966), 310-314.
- Trocme, E. "L'Épître aux Romains et la Méthode Missionnaire de L'Apôtre Paul". *N.T.S.*, 7 (1960-1), 148-153.
- Turner, N. "Philology in New Testament Studies". *The Expository Times*, 71 (1959-60), 104-107.
- Unnik, W.C. van Tarsus or Jerusalem? The City of Paul's Youth. trans. G. Ogg from the Dutch. London: Epworth Press, 1962.
- Unnik, W.C. van  
editor Neotestamentica et Patristica. Freundesgabe Oscar Cullmann. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*. 6. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962.
- Vaughan, C.J. ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. London and New York: MacMillan and Co., 1893.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Penguin Books, reprinted with revisions 1968.
- Vidler, A.R. Christ's Strange Work. An Exposition of the Three Uses of God's Law. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., revised and enlarged 1963.
- Vos, G. The Pauline Eschatology. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, second printing 1961.
- Weiss, B. Die Paulinischen Briefe im Berichtigten Text. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896.
- Weiss, J. The History of Primitive Christianity. 2 Vols. completed R. Knopf, ed. F.C. Grant. London: MacMillan and Co. Limited, 1937.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1 Q Serek 111,13 - 1V,26)". *Revue de Qumran*, 3 (1961-2), 413-441.
- Westcott, B.F. St. Paul and Justification. An Exposition of the Teaching in the Epistles to Rome and Galatia. London: MacMillan and Co. Limited, 1913.

- White, E. Saint Paul: The Man and his Mind.  
A Psychological Assessment.  
London and Edinburgh: Marshall and Scott, 1958.
- Whiteley, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul.  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Whyte, A. "The Apostle Paul".  
Edinburgh and London: Oliphant Anderson and  
Ferrier, 1903.
- Wikenhauser, A. New Testament Introduction.  
trans. J. Cunningham from second edition.  
New York: Herder and Herder; Edinburgh and London:  
Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1956.
- Williams, C.S.C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.  
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957.
- Windisch, H. The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount.  
trans. S.M. Gilmour.  
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.
- Winston, D. "The Iranian Component in the Bible, Apocrypha,  
and Qumran: A Review of the Evidence".  
History of Religions, 5 (1965-66), 183-216.
- Wood, A.S. "The Theology of Luther's Lectures on Romans".  
S.J.T., 3 (1950), 1-18; 113-126.
- Wood, H.G. "The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents  
and Consequences".  
N.T.S., 1 (1954-55), 276-282.
- Wood, J.E. "Pauline Studies and the Dead Sea Scrolls".  
The Expository Times, 78 (1967), 308-311.
- Wrede, W. Paul.  
trans. E. Lummis (Paulus, Halle, 1905).  
London: Philip Green, 1907.
- Yun, S.B. Römer 7,25 und der Pneumatikos. Ein Exegetisches  
Problem der Anthropologie des Paulus.  
Ton-A-Verlag Seoul, Korea, 1958.
- Zahn, T. Introduction to the New Testament. Vol.1.  
trans. J.M. Trout and others (Einleitung in das  
Neue Testament, third German edition)  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, second edition revised 1917.

- Zahn, T. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.  
Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Band 6.  
 Leipzig und Erlangen: W. Scholl, dritte Auflage 1925.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles.  
 Oxford: University Press, 1953.

As regards the text of the New Testament, we have worked mainly from:-

ὁ Κανὼν Συνέκρου.

British and Foreign Bible Society (E. Nestle): London, 1945.

The Greek New Testament (K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren).  
 Bible Societies: New York, London, Edinburgh etc., 1966.

As regards the English Bible we have worked mainly from the R.S.V., and the N.E.B.

Addendum

"Executive Health" is published by Executive  
 Publications, P.O. Box 589, Rancho Santa Fe,  
 California, 92067.

---